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2012 Dues Notice

Remember to pay your 2012 dues—$15—by the end of January. Your pink dues notice is enclosed. The label on it, the same as your mailing label, bears your dues status on its upper right. The dues status is the most recent year for which your dues were paid. If dues status is 2011, you owe only $15 for 2012; if you are paid through 2012 or a future year, or your status is in capital letters, you owe nothing. If you have fallen behind (status 2010 or earlier), please pay your dues as a matter of urgency. A donation is requested from all and will be truly appreciated. Send payment in the envelope provided. If we may suggest, please do it now! This removes it from your ‘to do’ list and spares us sending tedious reminders, which we continue to do, so no valued member falls away. To remind you to pay requires work and has a cost; you may fret about the unpaid dues, yourself.

For convenience, you may pay dues in advance for any number of years at the current rate. You will be spared the bother of paying annually and protected from dues increases for that number of years. Life Memberships are available for $360 ($250 for those 65 and over) and even more convenient. Either of these options will reduce your clerical work. If you choose either, mark it on the pink dues form.

Donations to the General Fund may be made now or at any time; these and Donations are convenient to make using the same pink dues form. Donations are tax-deductible, but dues payments and goods purchases are not.

Our Fiscal Year 2012 began on 1 October 2011. Governments and many corporations use the artifice of a fiscal year so that annual financial activities do not occur at the end of the calendar year. The result is that year-end bookkeeping and analysis (in Sept. and Oct.) do not coincide with the end of the calendar year or our other main fiscal activity, dues collection, in January, the Month of the Royal Martyrdom, as has been, by tradition, in Britain and here as far back as anyone remembers. Fiscal Year 2012 includes the December 2011 and the June 2012 issues of SKCM News.

Schedule for 2012 Dues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Oct. 2011</td>
<td>Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan. 2012</td>
<td>Deadline to resign for 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Jan. 2012</td>
<td>Due date for 2012 dues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb.–30 Sept. 2012</td>
<td>Unpaid 2012 dues are overdue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Oct. 2012</td>
<td>Unpaid 2012 dues are delinquent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Renewal policy. Please note that memberships renew automatically on 1 January unless cancelled in writing before then, reflecting the long-held practice, a courtesy, not to interrupt members’ subscriptions. Experience validates this: members usually pay up but can be late.

Become a Patron of the
2012 Annual Mass

Please support the XXIX Annual Mass (28 January 2012) at The Church of All Saints. Appleton, Wisconsin, financially and by attending. Consider asking a friend who is a prospective member to join you at mass and to enjoy the luncheon as your guest.

A notice suitable to be copied and posted appears on p. 3 and on our website. Please post it at places you patronize and send some to friends. Strategic placement may attract potential members to attend; this is the occasion of most new member enrollments. Seriously consider becoming a Patron or Donor. Use the purple slip enclosed. Your tax-deductible contributions support expenses of the mass, such as the music, flowers honoring the memory of departed members of the Society, the Select Preacher’s expenses, and other associated costs, A.M.D.G.
The Recognition 2011
A REPORT ON OUR CELEBRATION OF ITS 350TH ANNIVERSARY
7 May 2011,
The Church of the Resurrection,
New York City,
the Solemnity of the Semiseptcentenary of the Recognition of the Cultus of King Charles the Martyr

Twenty-six April 1661 was the actual date of the Convocations’ unanimous vote, in joint session, to approve the State Service for 30 January to be incorporated into the Book of Common Prayer, 1662, then undergoing final revisions. The above apostrophic placement is correct: That vote took place on one of the rare occasions of the Convocations of Canterbury and York meeting jointly. During Anno Domini 2011, a ‘semiseptcentury’ having elapsed since 1661, we celebrated that ecclesiastical recognition of the Cultus we perpetuate. This feast has usually been called the Canonization of Saint Charles and so celebrated by the British Society and in the U.S., by the NY Chapter led by Dr. Bernard Brennan 1994-2004.

As it happened, Easter, 2011 fell on 24 April. The vote recognizing the cultus took place on 26 April 1661. This year the actual 350th Anniversary, 26 April 2011, was Easter Tuesday, a day for celebrating solely the Resurrection. Canon Swain, rector of the Church of the Resurrection, scheduled our gathering on the next available Saturday, 7 May.

Two Important, Related Points
In 1894, it was Easter Tuesday when Mrs. Greville-Nugent and Father Fish founded the Society of King Charles the Martyr. The date was 27 March.

The date 7 May is of some significance to the Society as well. Mr. Hadley Hope-Nicholson, (C&K’s editor) proposed it as a convenient date for a Spring celebration and gathering, and to name it the Exaltation of Saint Charles. It was to memorialize an obscure event, the replacement of a statue of the Martyr King in Guildhall Yard on 7 May 1660, anticipating the Restoration by twenty-two days.

My research by Mr. David Roberts, R.M.C.U., who is knowledgeable about the City of London, has not revealed any details of such a likeness; the proposed celebration never caught on.

We celebrated the Recognition of the Cultus at the Resurrection, on the Upper East Side of Manhattan (East 74th St., between Lexington and Second Avenues), enjoying the ambience of the tastefully appointed church and the hospitality of its rector, a stalwart Society member The Rev’d Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC, OL, and his parishioners. It was the fourth time a pan-Regional gathering of our American Region was hosted by this generous and gracious priest, a long-time Society member and my friend.

American Region Gatherings Hosted by Canon Swain
1999  350th Anniv., Royal Martyrdom S. Clement’s, Phila.
2005  XXII Annual Mass Resurrection, NYC
2011  350th Anniv., Recognition of Cultus Resurrection, NYC

Canon Swain has been an immense help, sharing his experience as Superior-General of the Guild of All Souls in America, and being supportive in spirit, mind, and body with his prayers, ideas, practical advice, and action.

The parish, an 1866 foundation originally called the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, occupies an 1869 building by James Renwick, Jr., of Renwick & Sands. Although surrounded by massive residences of its period and newer, larger apartment buildings, the distinctive Gothic church building asserts itself on the block. Surprisingly, given its original title, the parish’s Anglo-Catholic doctrine and liturgy date from 1920; those together with an excellent music program and strong, articulate Anglo-Catholic preaching characterize the parish today. The music is enhanced by a recently rebuilt Casavant Frères Organ (Op. 665, 1916) of 49 stops and 40 ranks and gifted music director, organist, and mixed choir.

The church is fittingly adorned with a very artistic and warmly inviting Shrine of the Sacred
Heart of Jesus. Here at the locus of American Chantry work of The Guild of All Souls, is centred its main opus, praying for the Holy Souls.

Setting a celebratory tone for the solemn votive mass of King Charles the Martyr, Organist and Choir Master David Enlow’s organ brought about the entrance of the Sacred Ministers, Canon Swain, celebrant, The Rev’d R. Trent Fraser, SSC, deacon of the mass, and The Rev’d Sean Wallace, sub-deacon, with the first of five favorite Society hymns. (Father Wallace is the parish’s honorary curate and Father Fraser, the rector of S. John the Evangelist, Newport RI.) The ordinary of the mass was Mozart’s Mass No. 5 in G, the Pastoralmesse, K. 140, a delightful composition by young Mozart, not a languid sort of ‘pastoral’, but tuneful and rhythmically assertive. The celebration of the Holy Mysteries was reverent and traditional. It was the setting for our worship, devotion, and our Select Preacher’s sermon, which included a historical overview of the State Service for 30 January and its placement in the Book of Common Prayer of 1662, and a forceful, definitive enunciation of the compelling reasons for wide observation of the 30 January commemoration of the Beheading of King Charles the Martyr. We rejoice in Canon Wright’s commitment to this Cause and his outspoken advocacy of the annual celebration in honor of the Martyr King, a central, yet much misunderstood and neglected, figure defining our identity as Anglicans. Canon Wright’s sermon included a rare, little-known quotation of some length in which the Martyr-King contrasts the BCP with the Directory, the rebels’ feeble attempt to displace the outlawed BCP. Canon Wright’s sermon appears at p 27.

Our faithful cadre adjourned to the undercroft for a buffet luncheon at which Dr. Wuonola expressed thanks for the invitation, to those who made the day’s celebration possible, and to those who attended and donated

To honor four who have contributed to the Cause and the Society over decades was the next order of business. On Mr. Richard Mammana (unavoidably absent), Father Mead, Canon Swain, and Canon Wright were conferred memberships in the Order of Laud, signifying our thanks. At pp. 12-13 their accomplishments are enumerated. Each new OL member has expressed his appreciation for the award, which makes explicit the honor and recognition each Trustee feels in his heart.

“The darkness comprehended it not.”

The harsh, heartless excision of Church and King from the British nation is nearly impossible for us to feature. The measures enacted by a mere semblance of the nation’s previous, legitimate government—indelicately but well termed “the rump of a rump”—are unimaginable in their brutish, totalitarian severity. In retrospect, we can now say that the régime’s actions had in toto a ‘seeming’ finality, but to those experiencing these changes, then, the bleakness was overwhelming—unimaginable. As remote as we are, we must not, we will not, pretend that we can imagine it. Then, the Restoration of Church and King and the Recognition of the Cultus were miracles.

True to our motto, this we must REMEMBER.
Supporters (47) of the 2011 Pan-Regional Celebrations

The Semiseptcentenary of the Recognition of the Cultus of King Charles the Martyr (25)

The 362nd Anniversary of the Decollation of Saint Charles, King & Martyr (41)

Our thanks are extended to those who contributed, by their attendance and monetarily, to the two Pan-Regional gatherings held this year, the Annual Mass on 29 Jan. 2011 in Washington DC at St. Paul’s Church, ‘K’ Street, and the special mass at the Church of the Resurrection, New York City on 7 May commemorating the 350th Anniversary of the Recognition of the Cultus of King Charles the Martyr. In New York, I was pleased to meet several very munificent supporters of the Society, two of them Benefactors, for the first time. This provided me with an opportunity to express my appreciation in person. Later, I was able to tell the forty-one who contributed to the Annual Mass how grateful we are, and to express my appreciation to the Music Benefactor who paid to add a string quartet to the Wood Mass’s accompaniment, a lasting contribution, and also paid the fees of the instrumentalists of the ensemble, Modern Musick, for their appearance in the rescored work’s première. The generosity was overwhelming and the result, stunning and altogether elegant.

Since our June issue, the names of more generous supporters have been added to these lists. Your support was critical to the success of these gatherings. We enjoyed and appreciated the worship, hospitality, and fellowship as guests of the respective parishes, rector, clergy, and people. Each mass was enhanced significantly by the music, which was made possible largely through your generosity. The friendly, welcoming, and gracious manner of these parishes is a big part of the experience of attending a Society gathering. The arrangements require extensive work, much of it behind the scenes, on the parts of many, all of whom we thank!

Mass Celebrating the Semiseptcentennial of the Recognition of the Cultus of King Charles the Martyr
7 May 2011

The Church of the Resurrection, New York City

Patrons (15)

Professor Thomas E. Bird, Ph.D., Ben.
Charles J. Briody III, Ben.,
in Mem. Justin Fashanu
Dennis P. Casey, Esq.
The Rev’d R. Trent Fraser, SSC
Hugh G. Hart
Jonathan A. Jensen, Ben.
C. Owen Johnson, Esq.
Allan F. Kramer II, Ben.
The Rev’d Dr. Joseph W. Lund, Ben.
Paul W. McKee, Ben., OL
Donald R. Reinecker
Colonel Robert W. Scott
The Rev’d Canon Nelson B. Skinner, SSC

The Rev’d Dr. Ralph T. Walker, SSC, OL
Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., Ben., OL

Donors (11)

Charles J. Bartlett
David B. J. Chase, Ph.D.
Colonel James W. Davis, Jr.
The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D.,
Archdeacon of Springfield (IL)
Theodore Richard Harvey
The Very Rev’d Canon Harry E. Krauss
James G. Stark
William Lee Younger
An Anonymous Member
The Rev’d Richardson A. Libby
Douglas G. Hudleston Channon
XXVIII Annual Mass
29 January 2011
Saint Paul’s Parish, Washington DC
Special Music Benefactor
An anonymous Benefactor commissioned and generously bore the costs of resoring the organ accompaniment of Wood’s Mass in F to add a string quartet, and of that ensemble’s performance on 29 January.

The Flowers
The flowers were given by Donald R. Reinecker, Patron of the 2011 Gatherings, in Mem. Departed Officers of the Society and Members of the American Region

Patrons (20)
Saint Paul’s Parish, Washington DC, Fourth Time Host Parish in 2011
Howard Bradley Bevard
Professor Thomas E. Bird, Ph.D., Ben.
Charles J. Briody III, Ben., in Mem. Justin Fashanu
William and Ruth FitzGerald
Hugh G. Hart
Jonathan A. Jensen, Ben.
Wilfred J. Keats, II
The Rev’d Dr. Joseph W. Lund, Ben.
Paul W. McKee, Ben., OL
The Rt. Rev’d Dr. James W. Montgomery, Ben.
Donald R. Reinecker
J. Douglass Ruff, Esq., Ben., OL
Colonel Robert W. Scott
Philip Terzian, Ben.
A. Weldon Walker III
The Rev’d Dr. Ralph T. Walker, SSC, OL
Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., Ben., OL

Donors (21)
David B. J. Chase, Ph.D.
Donald McKenzie Davis
Colonel James W. Davis, Jr.
The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D., Archdeacon of Springfield (IL)
Professor Charles R. Forker
Theodore Richard Harvey
The Rev’d Vern E. Jones, OL
Dr. James C. Kelly
The Very Rev’d Canon Harry E. Krauss
James G. Stark
William Lee Younger
An Anonymous Member
The Rev’d Philip C. Jacobs III
The Rev’d John B. Pahls, Jr., S.T.M.
The Rev’d Canon William H. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D., and Mrs. Swatos
Charles Barethaler, Ben.
The Rev’d Dr. Thomas W. Bauer
The Rev’d Richardson A. Libby
Captain Howard S. Browne
Douglas G. Hudleston Channon
The Rev’d Dr. W. Ralph Gardiner
A SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIP

Archives of the Society of King Charles the Martyr,
American Region, To Be Located at Nashotah House Seminary

Our archival materials are very scant before 1972, when Mrs. Carnahan died and Mrs. Langlois became American Representative (initially U.S.A. Hon. Secretary).

Publications in Seminary Libraries. Four seminary libraries hold SKCM News: The General Theological Seminary, NYC; Nashotah House Theological Seminary, Nashotah WI; Garrett-Evangelical Seminary (Evanston IL, Methodist); and the Univ. of the South (Sewanee) School of Theology. These libraries have received SKCM News since 2010, 1992, 1989, and 1985, respectively. We are working with them systematically to close gaps in their holdings, to extend their runs back, and to add Church and King. The latter projects have been initiated with The General Theological Seminary’s director, The Rev’d Andrew Kadel. The publications (esp. C&K) are not available as originals—at all or in adequate numbers—so some will be copies.

Archives. We have concluded an agreement with Nashotah House Librarian David G. Sherwood that the archives of the American Region of the Society be located at the House. (The Archives of The Episcopal Church had been informally considered a few years ago; we were unable to initiate a small collaboration on the History project with them. The Publications Editor has served as de facto contact with the Archives, representing Society depositors and users, because organizing our Archival materials has so far been part and parcel of the History Project (2008-11). We have preliminarily assessed, estimated, and reported the quantity and nature of our archival materials. The official papers of the Corporation are the responsibility of the Secretary of the Board, J. Douglass Ruff, Esq., who will organize them. The originals of them will be incorporated into the archives in due course. The contents of our Archives are to be kept and curated at the professional discretion of the Librarian of the Frances Donaldson Library at Nashotah House. Mr. Sherwood, a 15-year Society member, is also Associate Professor of Bibliography and has been an instructor in Ascetical Theology. The Archives will be accessible to general users and to scholars.

The Names below Were Omitted Previously, We Apologize to You and Are Grateful for your Support and Kindness during 2009 & 2010.

XXVI Annual Mass, S. Stephen’s Church, Providence RI, 31 January 2009
Elizabeth M. Alexander and Meredith Rubin, Photographers

XXVII Annual Mass, Grace & S. Peter’s Church, Baltimore MD, 30 January 2010
Michael Byrd, Photographer

Mass Commemorating the Restoration’s CCCL Anniversary, S. Barnabas Church, Omaha NE, 29 May 2010
Mel Bohn, Photographer

We Thank These for Support and Kindnesses during 2011

XXVIII Annual Mass, Washington DC, 29 January 2011
Saint Paul’s Parish, K Street; Fourth Time Annual Mass Host
The Rev’d Andrew L. Sloane, D.D., Rector & Second Time Annual Mass Host
The Rev’d Nathan J. A. Humphrey, Vicar, Deacon of the Mass
David B. J. Chase, Ph.D., Master of Acolytes, Sub-deacon
The Rev’d Dr. Richard C. Martin, SSC, OL, Select Preacher and Celebrant
Paul W. McKee, Ben., OL, Host Parish Chapter Secretary
The Rt. Rev’d Dr. James W. Montgomery, Ben., Presence at the Annual Mass and his
Deacons of Honor, The Rev’d Frederick S. Thomas, Jr., SSC, and The Rev’d Michael J. Malone
A. Weldon Walker III, Photographer

The Anonymous Benefactor
who funded Robert Goethe’s resoring the organ accompaniment to Charles Wood’s Mass in F, adding parts for String Quartet; and the
premiere of this version on 29 Jan. 2011, in which Saint Paul’s Choir was joined by a String Quartet drawn from Modern Musick
and Organist John Bradford Bohl (Asst. Dir. of Music), under Robert McCormick, Director of Music

Recognition of the Cultus Semiseptcentenary Mass, New York, 7 May 2011
Church of the Resurrection, New York City
The Rev’d Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC, OL, Rector, Celebrant, & Fourth Time Pan-Regional Gathering Host
The Rev’d R. Trent Fraser, SSC, Deacon of the Mass
The Rev’d Sean Wallace, Honorary Curate, Sub-deacon
David Enlow, M.Mus., F.A.G.O.; The Resurrection Choir

The Rowfant Lecture, Cleveland OH, 17 Nov. 2010
The Rev’d Canon Professor Arnold W. Klukas, Ph.D., invited lecturer

Persons Newly Involved with the Publications* of the Society’s American Region
Charles J. Bartlett, author, reviewer, & reporter
Benjamin Guyer, author
The Most Rev’d Mark Haverland, Ph.D., author
The Rev’d Deacon J. David E. Milam, author
John Arthur Edward Windsor, Ben., author & reviewer
Suzanne G. Bowles, Ph.D., email Communique Editorial Committee
The Rev’d Donald H. Langlois, SKCM News H-net Reviews; Email Communique Editorial Committee
J. Douglass Ruff, Esq., Ben., OL, Email Communique Editorial Committee

Persons Continuing to Be Involved with the Publications* of the Society’s American Region
Suzanne G. Bowles, Ph.D., reviewer
David D. Butler-Chamberlain, Esq., reviewer, essayist, & poet
Richard J. Mammana, Jr., OL, author, reviewer, & poetry editor
Sarah Gilmer Payne, Ben., OL, reviewer
Alexander Roman, Ph.D., OL, essayist, reviewer, & devotional writer
The Rev’d Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC, OL, reviewer
Philip Terzian, Ben. (Literary Editor, The Weekly Standard), writer

*SKCM News unless otherwise specified

Without your donations and support acknowledged above, it would be impossible for our Society to be what it is. The
Annual Mass & Luncheon, other gatherings, publications, and our witness and visibility throughout North America would
all be diminished. THANK YOU.

XXIX Annual Mass, All Saints, Appleton WI, 11 a.m. 28 January 2012
The 363rd Anniversary of the Royal Martyrdom

Regrettably, insurmountable scheduling conflicts have necessitated cancellation of the previously
arranged 2012 Annual Mass, which was set for 28 Jan. at Nashotah House.
However, we are delighted to announce that our Annual Mass has been rescheduled at All
Saints’ Church, Appleton WI, at 11 a.m. on Saturday 28 January 2012, at the invitation of The
Rev'd Patrick Twomey, rector. The bishop of Fond du Lac, The Rt. Rev'd Russell E. Jacobus, D.D., has been very welcoming and is expected to be present.

Our Select Preacher at the Annual Mass will be The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D., Archdeacon of Springfield (IL), who has been a member of the Society for over 20 years. We thank him for honoring the invitation to preach at Nashotah House, from when the 2012 Annual Mass was to be there.

Our Luncheon. These and music details are being finalized as we go to press. A notice will be inserted in this mailing with the details, which will also be posted at www.skcm-usa.org at earliest convenience. Please check. We apologize for inconvenience.

The editor has been in Wisconsin about three dozen times, but not to Appleton, nor did he know of it; you may not know of it, but it is between two that you have heard of—Green Bay and Oshkosh. Appleton’s airport has six major airlines often flying to and from most major U.S. cities.

It seems that we are always talking about firsts, yet we are always spoken of, and regard ourselves, as traditionalists. In fact, we have not held an Annual Mass in the Midwest since they began in 1984. Not all Anglo-Catholics know that the dioceses of the Upper Midwest comprise the ‘Biretta Belt’, not a chimeric habiliment but an area of the U.S. to the West of the Great Lakes (the nearest are Lakes Superior and Michigan) and now comprising roughly (but changing over time) seven dioceses, Milwaukee, Eau Claire, Fond du Lac, Springfield, Quincy, Chicago, and Northern Indiana. The bishops of these dioceses have been well-known Anglo-Catholics, ‘big names’, as it were, from Grafton to Brady, bishops of Fond du Lac, where Appleton is. True to that model, the parish at which we will gather was begun by Missionary Bishop Jackson Kemper, who held services in 1854-5 before its foundation in 1856 as Grace Church. He laid the cornerstone in 1864. After several moves between buildings and properties, including a move of the building itself, a new, stone edifice was built; its cornerstone was laid by Bishop Grafton in 1905. His coadjutor, Bishop Weller, preached at the first service that year, the year in which the name was changed to All Saints. The familiar photo known as the ‘Fond du Lac Circus’, with the many mitered bishops, is from Bp. Weller’s consecration (1900). Not only does the photo document Bp. Grafton’s broad, diverse, and prophetic ecumenical outreach, it precipitated a fashion revolution for Anglican bishops—from rochet and chimer to cope and miter—lappets were ‘in’, lace lawn was gone. A fire in 1949 left only the stone walls intact, but the church was speedily rebuilt. Money was raised to supplement insurance proceeds. A new Moller organ was purchased and installed, and the church, rededicated by Bishop Sturtevant in 1952.

May he rest in peace,
R. I. P.

William Ronald Crawford Miller, W.S.
Baron of Pittenweem

“Meticulous lawyer who had a taste for eccentric modes of transport while abroad” *

Ronald Miller died on 28 June 2011, age 92, at Kwa Zulu Natal, Zuid Afrika, where he had stayed with his sister an increasing fraction of the time (dividing it between ZA and the Priory in Fife) since Hubert Fenwick’s death in 2003.

Mr. Miller studied at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and finished in 1940. He served in WW II with the First Battalion, The Duke of Wellington’s Regiment, rising to the rank of Captain. He kept a strong regimental connection, attending reunions and displaying his bronze statue of the Iron Duke
in his sitting room. He served in N. Africa, Italy, Palestine, Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, and Cyprus and was wounded at Anzio. After the war he studied Scots Law at Edinburgh Univ., and then joined the firm of Davidson & Syme W.S. serving his legal apprenticeship as solicitor and Writer to the Signet. Qualifying in 1949, he joined Steedman Ramage & Co. W.S. becoming a partner and remaining until he retired in 1984. "He never seemed to lose a client except when they went to heaven."

He served the Royal Martyr Church Union as Secretary/Treasurer 1986-2003, when he was named a VP.** He and Mr. Fenwick organized the annual service at St Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh. He attended to the affairs of the Episcopal Church of Scotland in his retirement. During his career, no small number of Edinburgh's prominent brewers and distillers had been among his clients, in business and family affairs, and he was wont to observe that his work, which had to do with one kind of spirits, had moved, associating him with the Holy Spirit. He divided his time between Slayley Woods, his sister's home in South Africa, and the Priory at Pitenweem, of which he became titular Prior and Baron of Pitenweem, registering the Barony with his coat of arms to his great pleasure.

Pittenweem is located on the coast of Fife, to the East of King Charles’s birthplace, Dunfermline Castle, itself due north of Edinburgh—Edinburgh is situated on the Southern side of the Firth of Forth, Fife on the Northern. Hard by to the East of Pitenweem are the famous links of St Andrews.

Ronald Miller was buried in Scotland as he directed. His survivors are his sister, Jean, and nieces Elizabeth and Jennifer. There is no heir to the Barony.

[We thank Gordon Davidson, whose vital words (The Scotsman, 26 Jul. 2011) provided vivid quotations of Mr. Miller’s vita—vocation, vacations, and notably the veracious characterization we have chosen as headline.]

*During the years after WW II, circumstances in Europe as in North America were greatly straitened. (Only recently, a quarter page of an already deteriorated 1949 Church & King turned into dust upon a light touch.) Shortage was undoubtedly a factor in their choice of transportation when Ronnie and Hubert vacationed on the Continent, not eccentricity alone. In addition, Hubert’s books required good stories. Hence, the stories rapidly passed into the realm of urban legend. The early journeys tended to rely on small, underpowered French cars. On one occasion they travelled around Italy on Vespa and Lambretta scooters, wearing Glengarry caps.

**Mr. Fenwick was Secretary-Treasurer R.M.C.U. 1961-86, Editor of the Royal Martyr Annual 1963-2003, and Chairman 1986-2003; his service in the latter offices was cut short by his death in 2003.

A Greeting from Robin Davies, Chairman, S.K.C.M.-Great Britain and Editor, Church and King

It will be apparent that the Society’s Chairman, Robin Davies, composed the following greeting for our 7 May gathering in New York. Its use on that occasion was precluded by mutualcomputer difficulties. In any event, its sentiments are as valid now as they were then. It is always good to be in contact: We value our filial, fraternal, and collegial relations with Robin, who serves in many capacities, as Chairman, Editor, and Secretary/Treasurer of S.K.C.M. in Britain. For that matter, we remain in regular contact with his predecessor as Chairman and Editor, Father Barrie Williams, now in the positions of President (jointly with Fr. Thompson) and Chaplain (North), based as he is in Whitby. Dr. Williams began his long association with the Society during his student days with the Cambridge chapter, showing the value of the Society’s presence locally and in university.

Mr. Davies writes,

The 350th Anniversary of the approval by Convocation of the special service commemorating the martyrdom of King Charles reminds us of the reason why this was done. A lengthy and bloody period of
struggle in the Church of England matching that on the Continent of Europe led to the destruction of both church and monarchy in 1649. Yet a mere eleven years later both had been miraculously restored to their undoubted triumph and apogee.

The struggle originating in the Anglican Communion has not—thank God—been violent as that in the Elizabethan and Stuart eras of the Church of England was, but it has been traumatic in its own way for those affected. Many loyal Anglicans have been forced into exile, joining first the continuing church movement and now the Ordinariate. We earnestly hope that as did the exiles of the 1650s they will maintain their devotion to the Royal Martyr and their Anglican Patrimony.

Pope John Paul II urged "local churches to ensure that the memory of those who have suffered martyrdom should be safeguarded [and calls this] the most convincing form of ecumenism." We can all agree on the validity of the martyrdoms of (say) the Orthodox martyrs of the Communist yoke and the Jesuit martyrs of Japan—may the time come when the Universal Church acknowledges the martyrdom of Saint Charles in defence of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith. I urge you to maintain your witness in the difficult circumstances of the church in North America in furtherance of the principles for which he died.

—Robin J. B. Davies (Chairman, S.K.C.M.)

**A Greeting from David Roberts, R.M.C.U.**

We have also heard from David Roberts of The Union, our sister society. He writes,

I am very happy to send, on behalf of the Royal Martyr Church Union’s Executive Committee, all good wishes and fraternal greetings in the spirit of the Royal Martyr, to all members of the Society of King Charles the Martyr in North America for 2012 and for their commemorations in January.

—E. David Roberts (Secretary/Treasurer, R.M.C.U.)

**Editorial – Headlines**

*Here, we mention several headline inaccuracies,* not for any significance of their own but for the issues they raise. We seldom write to editors about these inaccuracies as was done in the past; they are now so very prevalent. Editors, seeing our religious affiliation and Cause, conclude that we are not a worthwhile constituency. Some writers may have been taught that the ‘big picture’ is the important thing, that little mistakes don’t matter, and not to worry about details because they are only technicalities. In a measurement, a few degrees of temperature, a few inches, or the position of a decimal point can make a big difference; when writing, a word choice can alter meaning profoundly.

*The Washington Post* reported on an exhibit at the Walters in Baltimore: "Splendor abounds in museum's display of grisly holy relics". Grisly? It once meant ‘full of gristle’. Now it is used to describe a movie scene: victim’s blood drips from crazed perp’s elbows. About 30 years ago the editor was introduced to a collecting specialty that suits him, relics. In that time, he has never seen a grisly one, although the piece of a martyr's diaphragm must initially have been bloody. A martyr's power derives from his heroic sacrifice for Christ, not horror movie verbiage. The word in the Post’s headline was chosen to draw attention using sensationalism.

The "scaffold gift" reported in June (SN, June 2011, pp. 56-7) was not enough to grab your gaze —maybe the scaffold was a painter's—so The Oxford Times added a word of portent. Then its headline read, "The scaffold gift of a doomed monarch". To us who venerate him as a martyr, his martyrdom was foreordained, but not a doom. When he told his daughter that he would soon be with his Blessed Jesus, he was not foretelling doom, was he? No, Dr. Roman has taught us that the celebration of a saint’s birth tells us that his calling is foreordained.

…Tidings of Jesus, redemption and release.”

Not a few signs, omens, and portents are associated with King Charles the Martyr. Many seem to be the stuff of superstition and are not mentioned here, though their significance be highly regarded by some. *(top. 55)*
SOLEMN MASS OF SAINT CHARLES, K.M.,

in the Presence of the Bishop of Fond du Lac,
The Rt. Rev’d Russell E. Jacobus, D.D.

11 a.m., Saturday 28 January 2012

All Saints Church, Appleton WI

The Rev’d Patrick Twomey, Rector

Select Preacher, The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D.
Archdeacon of Springfield (IL)

Frank G. Rippl, Organist & Choirmaster

A LUNCHEON will follow. Check website** for details.

All Saints Church, 100 North Drew St., Appleton WI 54911

Location, driving directions, & about the church,
allsaintsapple@tds.net

S.K.C.M. Information, ** www.skcm-usa.org
Membership, email Doug Ruff, Secretary, douglassruff@aol.com
Four New Inaugural Members of the
Order of Blessed William Laud, Archbishop & Martyr

We are pleased to report that at our recent New York gathering, elections of four more members of the Order of Blessed William Laud, Abp. & Martyr, Mr. Richard J. Mammana, Jr., Father Andrew C. Mead, Canon Barry E. B. Swain, and Canon Professor J. Robert Wright were announced. We heartily congratulate these true exemplars who have supported S.K.C.M.’s American Region in significant ways. The laudations below, from their Commendations, praise their distinguished contributions.

ELECTED 27 OCTOBER 2000 WITH EFFECT AS OF 26 JANUARY 2011 & CONFERRD 7 MAY 2011

Richard J. Mammana, Jr., was voted an Inaugural Member of the Order of Bl. William Laud in recognition of his many accomplishments, to the benefit of the Society. Notably, he has produced written works for SKCM News and other publications in support of the Cause; through library and online research he has discovered many pieces of historical import that appeared during the Society’s earliest years in the U.S., has stored on CDs several dozen XVII Century sermons for 30 January from the originals in U.S. library archives, and has found multiple Caroline poems, articles, and mentions of the Society in diverse sources and at many locations. He founded Project Canterbury (which includes a major section on King Charles the Martyr) and serves on the Board of The Living Church. With knowledge of our activities and aims he has broadened awareness of our Society and increased its potential impact—through his writings and use of the internet—reaching back to 1894, when it was established in New York City, over a hundred years before he enrolled in 1998.

The Rev’d Andrew C. Mead, D.D., OBE, has been a supporter of the American Region for over two decades. In 1989, he hosted the VI Annual Mass at Boston’s Church of the Advent and preached, as he did in 1991at the VIII Annual Mass, at Guardian Angels, Lantana FL. Father Mead has been rector of three distinguished parishes, Good Shepherd, Rosemont PA; Advent, Boston; and Saint Thomas Fifth Avenue, New York City, and a Trustee of Nashotah House for over twenty years. He is one of two members of the Order of Laud who although a Supporter of the Society is not an enrolled member. Nonetheless, he has strongly spoken in support of the Society, its aims, our witness, and our activities. By this association, his reputation and his leadership have enhanced our Society’s profile throughout North America.

The Rev’d Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC, ever since his enrollment in 1979, has been outspoken in his support for our Society, and has followed through by his actions. These include hosting our gatherings four times—in 1994 and 1999 at S. Clement’s, Phila., and at the Resurrection in New York City in 2005 and 2011 (the year of this award’s conferral)—as well as twice serving as Select Preacher at the Annual Mass, at All Saints, Ashmont, in 1997 and at Saint Paul’s, ’K’ Street in 2003. He has been a contributor to SKCM News, a trusted adviser, wise counselor, and supportive stalwart, aiding us in many ways for over thirty years of distinguished membership.

The Saint Mark’s-in-the-Bowery Professor of Ecclesiastical History at The General Theological Seminary in New York City, The Rev’d Canon J. Robert Wright, D.Phil. (Oxon.), &c, is well known as an ecclesiastical historian and as Historiographer of TEC. He has worked internationally in pursuit of ecumenical assignments. A prolific author, his works span a breadth of topics. As a result of his leadership as President of The Anglican Society, nine years ago that Society joined us by officially adopting a position in favor of placing 30 January on TEC’s calendar. As Select Preacher at our Masses in 2002 and 2011 and in writing he has explained in detail and expounded vigorously the
importance of doing so, citing King Charles's centrality in the definition of Anglican Identity. His support and the alliance of Societies add to the case in arguing for this objective.

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

(After Each Departed Member’s Name Is a Cross * and Year of Death. Requiescat in pace.)

Nick F. Behrens
Professor Bernard P. Brennan, Ph.D., Ben. * 2006
Elizabeth Agnes Ballantyne Carnahan * 1972
Gary Adrian Cole * 1994
Richard G. Dumin * 2007
William M. Gardner, Jr.
The Rev’d Canon Robert S. H. Greene, SSC


Professor Martin Joseph Havran, Ph.D. * 2000
Lee Hopkins
The Rev’d Vern E. Jones
The Rev’d David C. Kennedy, SSC, D.D.
Eleanor Emma Langlois * 1999
Professor Ernest H. Latham, Jr., Ph.D.
Richard J. Mammana, Jr.
Everett Courtland Martin, Ben. * 2004
The Rev’d Dr. Richard Cornish Martin, SSC
Robert Nicely Mattis * 2000
Paul White McKee, Ben.

James Bailey Parker
Sarah Gilmer Payne, Ben.
Charles F. Peace IV
Stephen C. Petrica
Alexander Roman, Ph.D.
John Douglass Ruff, Esq., Ben.

The Rev’d Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC

The Rev’d Ralph T. Walker, SSC, D.D.

Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., Ben.

**Commemorations of Royal Martyr Day, 2012**

**United States** – A. Donald Evans, Chapter Liaison & the Editor

Note that many services will be on 30 January, which is Monday in 2012. Some churches may anticipate the feast with a commemoration on Sunday. We urge you to check in advance the time of service, which may vary with date, day of the week, and other factors, and whether it is a commemoration of King Charles The Martyr. If yes, support and attend it. If not, please encourage the future observance of KC. Our press time for the Dec. SKCM News is early, so many service schedules are not finalized. Parishes’ regular weekly schedules are ever-changing! Please bring any and all errors of substance to our attention. In addition to the phone numbers listed, most of the parishes have websites; they are easily found: google Parish Name, City, and State abbrev. for it If your parish’s information is absent or wrong on our list, please send it to the editor by email or on a postcard; it will be added to this standing list: Let’s strive to double the number of listings (<70 are listed here, because we deleted some erroneous ones). If you send particular information each year—confirmed service time, preacher, and eats—that will of course be included and featured Few of us will admit to enjoying sermons, yet a featured preacher will improve attendance, as will a program afterwards. Send a report, a sentence will suffice, of the event you attend (parish, local, or any) when it is fresh in your mind, whether or not you are ‘officially’ reporting, especially if you are ‘Mystery worshiper’. If you see such reports on any of our gatherings, please share them with the editor. **Notices and Reports** of gatherings further our primary Cause, the Observance of 30 January.

**Key to notations:** Dedication, Chapel *, Shrine *, Relic *, Statue *, Depiction(s) [], Stained Glass Window +

TN Tennessee Chapter Greg Smith, Chapter Secretary, Fr. Michael Murphy, SSC, Chaplain

13
The **Tennessee Chapter** sponsors a Mass of Saint Charles to be celebrated at **11 a.m. on Saturday 28 January 2012** at Trinity Church, Clarksville. Contact Mr. Smith for info. at gregsmithdtm@charter.net org 615 310 4765

Alabama AL **Saint Charles, King & Martyr**, Huntsville, Solemn High Mass on Sunday 29 January in commemoration of King Charles the Martyr. Being their Patronal Feast, the annual business meeting of the parish is usually held after the service.

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

CA †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, 415 749 6300

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

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

CO §§Saint Charles the Martyr, Fort Morgan, Fr Bill Kindel, Priest-in-Charge 970 867 6228

District of Columbia, Washington, DC Ascension & Saint Agnes, Fr. Lane Davenport, Rector 202 347 8161

DC †Saint Paul’s, K Street, Fr. Andrew Sloane, Rector 202 337 2020

Florida FL §§Holy Guardian Angels, Lantana, Fr. David Kennedy, SSC, Rector. Low mass 7:45 a.m. with occasional breakfast to follow at the Dune Deck Café.

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

GA Saint Paul’s, Savannah, Very Rev’d William Willoughby III 912 232 0274

Illinois IL Ascension, Chicago, Fr. Gary Fertig, Rector 312 664 1271

Indiana IN S. Andrew’s Anglican Church, Evansville, low mass with homily 6 p.m., Fr. Robert Todd Giffin, Rector

IN §Saint Paul’s, Mishawaka, Fr. David Ottsen 574 144 9090

IN Holy Trinity, Peru, Fr. Douglas Hungerford

Kentucky KY Saint Michael and All Angels, Louisville, Norman Jefferies II

Louisiana LA Saint Luke’s, Baton Rouge, Canon Brian Koehler, Rector 225 926 5343

Massachusetts MA Advent, Boston, Fr. Allan Warren, Rector 617 523 2377

MA §§All Saints, Ashmont, Dorchester, Boston www.allsaints.net Fr. Michael Godderz, SSC, Rector

Maryland MD *S Grace & Saint Peter’s, Baltimore 410 539 1395. Father F. S. Thomas, SSC, Rector

Nebraska NE Saint Barnabas, Omaha, Fr. Robert Scheibhofer, Rector 204 558 4633 (Great Plains Chapter, Nick Behrens, Chapter Secretary 402 455 4492)

The **Great Plains observance will be on Saturday 28 January 2012 at 11 a.m.** at Saint Barnabas Church (TAC) at the corner of 40th and Davenport Streets in Omaha, Nebraska. As in other years, the service will be High Mass with Sung Morning Prayer serving at the Ante-Communion. Canticles, Hymns and Service Music to be led by the choir of S. Barnabas Church, Nick Behrens OL, Organist and Choirmaster.

The celebrant will be The Rev’d Robert Scheibhofer, Rector of S. Barnabas. Preacher TBA. A brunch reception follows the service in the undercroft. Church 402-558-4633 or chapter secretary, Nick Behrens 402-455-4492; church website www.saintbarnabas.net

NE **Saint Charles**, Fairbury (Beatrice), Fr. Richard Moon, Rector 402 223 5515

Nevada NV §Chapel of the Holy Family, Saint Jude’s Ranch, Boulder City 1-800 492 3562

New York NY Resurrection, Manhattan, NYC www.resurrectionnyc.org Fr. Barry Swain, SSC, Rector. 12 noon low mass followed by 12:30 p.m. recitation of the Rosary, special intention for apostolic order & Catholic Truth in the Anglican Communion

NY †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 (W. 46th St.), Manhattan, NYC, Fr. Stephen Gerth, Rector 212 869 5830

NY All Saints’ Cathedral, Albany, 518 465 1432

NY Saint George’s, Schenectady, 518 374 3163

Ohio OH Saint James, Cleveland, Fr. Cyril Crume, Rector

Oregon OR Saint Mark’s, Portland, Fr. Mark Lillegard, Rector 503 223 2383 www.stmarks@stmarksportland.org

Pennsylvania PA *Saint Clement’s, Philadelphia, Canon Gordon Reid, Rector 215 563 1876
PA Saint Mark’s, Philadelphia, Fr. Shawn Mullen, Rector 215 735 1416
PA Good Shepherd, Rosemont, 215 525 7070
Rhode Island RI *Saint John the Evangelist, Newport, Fr. R. Trent Fraser, SSC, Rector 401 848 2561 saintjohnsnewport.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
South Carolina SC Holy Communion, Charleston, Fr. M. Dow Sanderson, SSC, Rector 843 722 2024
SC Chapel of Saint Charles, K.M., Mayesville Richard Hines  rth@rthconsulting.com
SC Good Shepherd, York, Fr. Donald Lowery goodship@ceo.net 803 684 4021
Tennessee TN All Saints Mission, Chattanooga
TN Chapel of the Apostles, University of the South, Sewanee, Chad Krouse chad.m.krouse@gmail.com
TN Tennessee Chapter Greg Smith, Chapter Secretary (see note above)
Texas TX Good Samaritan, Dallas, Fr. William Warnky, Rector 214 328 3883
TX Holy Cross, Dallas, Fr. R. Michael Tuck, Rector 214 528 3855
TX Good Shepherd, Cranbury, Fr. Stuart Smith, Rector 817 326 2035 ♦ Shrine  ♦ Chapel
TX Saint Charles the Martyr, Daingerfield, Fr. James Slack, Rector 903 645 7414 ♦ Statue  ♦ Depiction
TX Saint David of Wales, Denton, Fr. Sandy Hermann, SSC, Rector 940 387 2622 ♦ Stained glass window
TX Saint Francis, Dallas, Fr. David Allen, SSC, Rector 214 351 1401 ♦ Dedications
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 Stephen’s, Sherman, Fr. Martin Yost, SSC, Rector 903 892 6610
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 Crosthaite 972 991 3601
Virginia VA Saint Matthew’s, Newport News, Fr. Daniel Warren, M.D., Rector
VA * Saint Luke’s, Manakin-Sabot (Richmond), Fr. Michael Kerouac
WI Wisconsin Appleton, All Saints,
Location of Pan-Regional Annual Mass on Sat. 28 Jan. 2012, 11 a.m. Preacher, The Ven. Shawn W. Denney,
J.D.; rector, The Rev’d Patrick Twomey
WI All Saints’ Cathedral, Milwaukee, Very Rev’d George Hillman 414 271 7719
WI ‡ Chapel of Saint Mary the Virgin, Nashotah House, Nashotah, Canon Arnold Klukas, Ph.D., Vicar 262 646
6500

2012 – Canada – compiled by Alexander Roman, Ph.D.

Anglican Church of Canada:
King’s College Chapel, Univ of King’s Col, Halifax NS
Saint Peter’s Cathedral, Charlottetown PE
S Bartholomew’s Anglican Church, Toronto ON
S Martin in the Fields Anglican Church, Toronto ON
Saint Mary Magdalene, Toronto ON
S Matthias (Holy Cross Monastery & Parish), Toronto ON
Saint Thomas Anglican Church, Toronto ON
‡ S John the Evangelist Anglican Church, Montréal QC

Anglican Catholic Church of Canada:
Cathedral of S John the Evangelist, Victoria BC
Cathedral of the Annunciation, Ottawa ON
Saint Aidan’s Parish, Halifax NS
Parish of Our Lady and S Michael, Edmonton AB
Christ the King, Calgary AB
All Saints, Renfrew, Calgary AB
Holy Redeemer, Claresholm AB
Holy Trinity, Medicine Hat AB
Holy Nativity, Barrhaven ON
Saint Athanasius, Belleville/Roslin ON
Saint Mary’s, Chapleau ON
Saint Edmund’s, Kitchener ON
2012 – Britain
R.S.S. 11. a.m. Monday 30 January 2012, Wreath-laying at Equestrian Statue, Charing Cross traffic island
S.K.C.M.11:45 a.m. Act of Devotion at the place of the Royal Martyrdom 12 noon Monday 30 January 2012, Sung
R.S.S. sponsored Choral Evensong (6 p.m.) S. George’s Chapel, Windsor, the Clergy and Choir of the Royal
Peculiar.

The XXX Annual Mass, 2013, has not been scheduled yet.

XXXI Annual Mass – Saint Vincent’s Cathedral, Bedford TX
11 a.m., Saturday 25 January 2014
At the invitation of the Bishop of Fort Worth, The Rt. Rev’d Jack Leo Iker, SSC, D.D., we will gather
for our Annual Mass at his cathedral in 2014. We anticipate it eagerly as another first on our
schedule of Annual Masses. the XXXI Annual Mass, following by thirty years the first such gathering,
at S. Ignatius of Antioch, NYC, in 1984. On this occasion in 2014, it will be our privilege to meet for
the first time in ‘the Great State of Texas’ and, confirming the saying that ‘bigger is better’, we will be
gathering in a cathedral, the Cathedral Church of Saint Vincent, Cathedral of the Diocese of Fort Worth
and our long-time Bishop-member, The Rt. Rev’d Dr. Jack Iker. Ordained priest in 1974 and
consecrated in 1993 on the Vigil of S. Mark., he is contemporary with our Episcopal Patron, The Rt.
Rev’d Keith Lynn Ackerman, SSC, D.D., whose priestly ordination was also in 1974, a month and a half
after Bishop Iker’s, and who was consecrated on SS. Peter & Paul in 1994. At TEC’s triennial General
Convention, both of them witnessed to the Martyr King on more than one occasion, to the general
disapproval of the once-collegial House of Bishops. In their witness there, they joined another
Jerome (our Senior Reigning Bishop-member until he retired in 1999, giving way to Bishop Iker).

The XXXII Annual Mass, 2015, has not yet been scheduled.

XXXIII Annual Mass – Holy Communion, Charleston SC
11 a.m., Saturday 30 January 2016
Thanks to its rector’s invitation, the Church of the Holy Communion will be the venue of the
XXXIII Annual Mass, following by ten years the very successful gathering held there in 2006 with
Bishop Iker as the Parish’s guest and our Select Preacher. Both the rector, The Rev’d M. Dow
Sanderson, SSC, and the curate, The Rev’d Daniel L. Clark, SSC (a friend of the Editor), are Society
members, and chief among the clergy supportive of our Charlestonwe Carolanas Chapter, centered in
Charleston. This time the rector will sing the mass and serve as Select Preacher.

At the new parish’s 7 November 1848 organizational meeting, Bishop Gadsden announced his
choice for its name, Holy Communion. He could hardly have imagined that the parish’s Feast of Title
would be celebrated, as it is now, on Corpus Christi. After the War, the rector returned to find that
his residence had been confiscated. Many other vicissitudes have challenged the church and its
people. The earthquake of 1886 left the Sunday School building in a partially collapsed state. In 1898, Hurricane Hugo took the roof and caused water damage to the open structure. The church has remained an Anglo-Catholic bastion through thick and thin, true to its founding principles. For after the War, influenced by the Oxford Movement, its adoption of the Full Faith of the Catholic Church of England began in 1872 with innovations protested elsewhere, vested choir, altar candles, and processional cross! These were accepted by the bishops of South Carolina, although their own churchmanship and the parish's differed, and have continued ever since. In a talk on 11 October 1998, Dr. Alan Holmes described the mean furnishings at the first service on 12 Nov. 1848, yet he spoke of his own sense of God's abiding presence in the Church of the Holy Communion "just looking up into the darkness of the ceiling" (www.holycomm.org/history).

Thank you, General Fund Donors!

We appreciate the generosity of each member whose name is listed below. Of our members, 20% made gifts in support of our gatherings and/or the General Fund in 2011, a good level of participation. Their beneficence is the lifeblood of the Society.

Donors to the General Fund during 2011


$45-$150 (21)
The Rt. Rev’d Dr. James W. Montgomery, Ben.
Charles J. Briody III, Ben.
Dennis P. Casey, Esq.
The Rev’d Jack Leo Iker, SSC, D.D.
The Rev’eld Elijah B. White
in Mem. Anita Graf (Mrs. Elijah) White
John A. E. Windsor, Ben.
William L. Younger
The Rev’d Jeff Queen
Robert T. Booms, Esq.
James I. Corcoran, Esq.
Colonel James W. Davis, Jr.
The Rev’d Brian Francis Duffy
in Mem. The Rt. Rev’d & Mrs. Win. Schell
The Rev’d Canon Robert S. H. Greene, SSC, OL
Robert L. Hamaker
The Rev’d Vern E. Jones, OL
Charles K. Latham III
Allan F. Kramer II, Ben.
Rodney Roehner
Benton H. Marder, Jr.
Benjamin Guyer
Dr. Stuart E. Prall

$20-$40 (5)
Colonel Robert W. Scott
Sarah Gilmer Payne, Ben., OL
Suzanne G. Bowles, Ph.D.
The Rev’d Brian Francis Duffy
James G. Stark
Up to $15 (22)
Harvel Jim Crawford
Michael James Sheehan
Dr. Daniel C. Warren
The Rev’d W. Douglas Bond
David D. Butler-Chamberlain, Esq.
The Rev’d Canon James G. Monroe, Ph.D., SSC
Gregory V. Smith
Philip Terzian, Ben.
Alfred L. Toombs
A. Weldon Walker III
Captain Howard S. Browne
Samuel A. Manka
The Rev’d Dr. Richard Cornish Martin, SSC, OL
Colonel Stewart B. McCarty
The Rt. Rev’d Rodney Rae Michel, D.D.
Walter H. Morton
Miss Eileen M. O’Leary
Ernest Ramirez
Daniel Rathbun
Mark Randall Taylor
The Rev’d Elijah B. White
Charles J. Bartlett

Books (2 donors)
John A. E. Windsor, Ben.
16 Books (largely History & Biography)
John Hallberg Jones

The Letters of King Charles I, Sir Charles Petrie (Ed.)
in Mem. Colton Lloyd Jones
News of Members

The Rev’d John D. Alexander, SSC, rector of S. Stephen’s, Providence RI, was chosen chaplain of the Society of Mary by its Council, on which more than a few S.K.C.M. members serve.

The Guild of All Souls with the July 2011 number (Vol. LXXIX, No. 2) has enhanced The Intercession Paper to 5½ x 8½” format; its glossy cover displays color photographs front and back. The very handsome result will stand out on tract racks, contains a substantial letter from the Superior-General, and has larger type throughout. In short, it no longer looks just like it did when I first saw one in a tract rack in 1969. Of course this is all Canon Swain’s doing. We appreciate and admire his dedicated leadership and faithfulness.

INTERESTED MEMBERS MAY WRITE FOR INFORMATION ABOUT, AND TO ENROLL
IN: CAROLINE, DYNASTIC, MONARCHIST & DEVOTIONAL SOCIETIES

per annum, yearly. USD United States dollars, GBP British pounds Sterling. To avoid exorbitant bank draft and currency conversion charges, you may wish to pay using £ or £ sterling bank notes, enclosed in folded paper; be aware of attendant risk.

The Royal Martyr Church Union £15 pa, £20 for a couple
E. David Roberts, Esq., Sec. & Treas.
7, Nunnery Stables
St Albans, Herts. AL1 2AS UK
The Royal Stuart Society £22 pa non-UK £250 life non-UK
Thomas Fitzpatrick, Esq., Principal Secretary (checks must be made in GBP)
Southwell House
Egmore Road
Walsingham, Norfolk NR22 6BT UK
The Monarchist League £20 pa or $40 pa
P. O. Box 5307 (checks made in USD are accepted)
Bishop’s Stortford
Herts. CM23 3DZ UK

The June 2011 issue of the League’s magazine, The Monarchy, is richly illustrated and one of the finest ever. Members of an attractive new generation of royals are coming into their own world-wide. They are tastefully attired, show respect for their parents (as do the country’s people, the king’s or prince’s subjects), honor the traditions of their respective dynastic houses, and hold great promise. They embody the reality increasingly acknowledged by a new generation of historians who recognize the virtues of the venerable dynasties and do not have the instinctive opposition to monarchy shared by many historians of the previous generation with post-Versailles diplomats.

Society members Canon Kenneth Gunn-Walberg and Nick Behrens are involved in the League, the former as Eastern States Representative, and the latter, as Central States Representative. Nick also edits the regular American Member Newsletter. It regularly includes notices and reports of our Annual Mass and many other events of interest.

In the ‘Editor’s Miscellany’ which occupies the final pages of each issue of SN is noted the death of Archduke Otto of Austria and Hungary, an exemplar energizing and lending credibility, to historians’ Habsburg rehabilitation. (see p. 4X)

One would think that historians are the champions of illogic, concluding that WW I was caused by Archduke Francis Ferdinand, who was unwise enough to get himself assassinated!

U.S. DEVOTIONAL SOCIETIES

The Guild of All Souls $5 pa, $20 life
P. O. Box 721172,
Berkeley MI 48072 US
The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament $5 pa, $100 life
The Very Rev’d Dr. William Willoughby III, Secretary-General
Saint Paul’s Church
224 East 34th St.
Savannah GA 31401-8104 US
The Society of Mary $10 pa, $250 life
Mrs. Lynne Walker
P. O. Box 930
Lorton VA 22079-2930 US
The Guild of the Living Rosary of Our Lady and S. Dominic
The Rev’d Canon David Baumann, SSC, Chaplain $5 pa,
Episcopal Church of the Blessed Sacrament $20 life
1314 N. Angelina Drive
Placentia CA 92870-3442 US

The Guild has just published an attractive Manual.

More News of Members

The Rev’d Canon William H. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D., our President, serves the Diocese of Quincy (IL) as Canon Theologian. The new bishop, The Rt. Rev’d Abbot J. Alberto Morales, O.S.B., reappointed him in Fall 2010 to the position in which he had served under Vicar General of; the Diocese, Canon E. den Blauuwen.

The Rt. Rev’d Keith L. Ackerman, SSC, D.D., has served as our Episcopal Patron* since 1999, when he was appointed to succeed Bishop Harte.
He has served as Superior-General of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament since 1994, when he replaced Father Laurence Larson (1991-4), who had succeeded Bishop Brady. Those of you who knew Bp. Brady will know what is meant when it is said that he was truly one of a kind. He was also, “the last of his kind,” in the opinion of the editor, who said, “I still miss him.” Now, like that, but “in a way even more poignant, is the present fact that Bishop Ackerman is no longer Superior-General of the Confraternity, according to MONTH 2011 Intercession Paper of the Confraternity. As for our Society’s American Region, Episcopal Patron is our Patron’s title when he is a bishop [Ecclesiastical Patron, when not.] In this context ‘Episcopal’ is a generic term meaning bishop, indicating no specific affiliation of which we require none. In Britain, at least one of the Society’s patrons, The Rev’d Fr. J-M. Charles-Roux is a Rosminian Father, and as a matter of public record is affiliated with the Institutes of Charity, a Roman Catholic order; other patrons are unverified.

Dom (The Rev’d) Kyrill, O.S.B., a hermit of Saint Benedict’s Abbey, Bartonville IL, enrolled in the Society recently. He offers to pray at the altar of his hermitage chapel on behalf of a member’s intention. You may convey your request to him by email: fkyrill@comcast.net. It must be very difficult to practice the eremitical life in 2011; answering that call must surely be rewarded by a measure of Grace. What would the patriarch of monasticism, Saint Antony Abbot (c. 251-356) think of email? In his time a person could walk off into the desert, largely unremarked, but today even a person of no notoriety might find himself pursued by Interpol.

The Rev’d Dr. Thomas W. Bauer, whose witness to our Patron extends back to the ’70s, his Yale Days, when Norman Catir, Robert Bauer, Stephen Petrica, and he organized a Royal Martyr service, he visited Cuba in 2010 and the Eastern Mediterranean this year, singing in Turkey, Georgia, and Armenia in June with the Yale Alumni Chorus. Fr. Bauer read a memorable postprandial paper at the 27 Jan. 1990 gathering at Grace & S. Peter’s. Fr. Catir was Select Preacher at our Semiseptcentennial celebration of the Royal Martyrdom on 30 Jan. 1999 at S. Clement’s, while Stephen Petrica last year was awarded OL membership because in the mid-’90s his work on the Liturgical Manual gave to members more expressions with which to voice their veneration of King Charles.

William K. Pace of Los Angeles has made a gift of a paving stone honoring the Society to be placed in the Cathedral of Our Lady of the Angels. Like everything about the much discussed structure, it is one-of-a-kind. In this case, public recognition of our Society is provided in an unusual context. We give thanks for it and rejoice.

The media cover this unusual cathedral in a sensationalist way, as though it is inappropriate for architecture, design, and materials of construction as certain to building a church to be innovative, while on the other hand, in light of this innovative building, all churches that are traditional are somehow inferior, or that all future projects must innovate in precisely the same way, which is not innovation at all.

Mr. Pace’s idea to give thanks for our Society in the context of the LA Cathedral may be unusual, too, but it is also thoughtful, devout, and constructive, while non-constructive critics think their job is only to criticize—the building under discussion has too much of this, it has too little of that, X is too high, Y is too long—such uninformed carping causes chaos. Thoughtful criticism is Godly. Thoughts are brought together such that order, harmony, results. We appreciate the unusual initiative Mr. Pace has taken—it is appropriate. There are those who relish the controversy about the cathedral’s design, but what they do not think to mention is that all the usual functions of a cathedral are this cathedral’s functions, too. The prayers of all sorts, thanksgivings, lamentations, supplications, and praise, individual and corporate, the offerings of the Holy Sacrifice, ordinations, baptisms, marriages, funerals, large public gatherings happy and sad, jubilant and solemn, occur there, as ever, regardless of the attention the structure has attracted. The life, work, and witness are fundamental, while the design is incidental. “This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.” (Gen. xxviii: 17)

Another of our new members, The Rev’d Dr. Michael E. Ridgill, CJSB, SSC, is rector of Saint Bartholomew, Hartsville SC. He also has a Benedictine connection, as a tertiary of Three Rivers. And he is an S.S.C. priest. We look forward to seeing him take his place among the many Society members in North and South Carolina, the States named for King Charles.

It is not a good sign to be condemned to repeat one’s history that so much of what young people ‘know’ is misinformation. Take Virginia and Maryland. Among High Schoolers, suppose we had a discussion group on the establishment and early church of each state. Let’s start with Virginia and Maryland. What might it reveal about
the names of these states? Probably the group would say 'something to do with the Virgin Mary', which sounds less ridiculous than some origins they might propose. There is a saying in the news business that the truth is stranger than fiction. If you're leading the group of teenagers discussing state names, the group members might well accuse you of playing 'mind games' with them, when you tell them that Virginia’s name honors Elizabeth I, who was called the 'Virgin Queen'; and Maryland’s, Henrietta Maria, King Charles I’s Queen.

We WELCOME our New Members, Reinstated Members, and New Life Members, who are listed just below

**New and Reinstated Members • New Life Members • Life Member Roster**

**New Members (25)**
Brendan B. Baggitt
Professor Mark Cyril Bagin
Ryan M. Chegwinn
J. Michael Cutshaw, Esq.
Thomas Pinkney Davis
Matthew D. Dupee, Esq.
Professor Charles R. Forker
Robert F. Garrison
Jerry Hanna
Kevin Hanratty
Chris M. Jessen, Ph.D.
Dom Kyrill, O.S.B.
David Lewis
Michael J. Meehan
William K. Pace
William G. Peck
The Rev’d Dr. Michael L. Ridgill, CJSB, SSC
James G. Stark
Mark Randall Taylor
Bro. Jonathan Severus Turnner
Christopher Wells, Ph.D. 1
Maitland O. & Leoni O. Westbrook
Patrick White
Nancy Work

**FY 2012 (4)**
Matthew Hynd
John J. Klopack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Members (25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brendan B. Baggitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Mark Cyril Bagin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan M. Chegwinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Michael Cutshaw, Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Pinkney Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew D. Dupee, Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Charles R. Forker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert F. Garrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Hanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Hanratty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris M. Jessen, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom Kyrill, O.S.B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael J. Meehan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William K. Pace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William G. Peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rev’d Dr. Michael L. Ridgill, CJSB, SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James G. Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Randall Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bro. Jonathan Severus Turnner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Wells, Ph.D. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitland O. &amp; Leoni O. Westbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reinstated Members (2)**
Mary Carey Chamberlain 2
George H. Eatman 3
2 *Lost for 12 years 1999-2011
3 *Lost for 22 years 1989-2011

**New Life Members (3)**
Howard Bradley Bevard
Professor Charles R. Forker
Sherwood O. Jones

**Roster of Life Members (11)**
The Rev’d John D. Alexander, SSC
Professor Thomas E. Bird, Ph.D., Ben.
Will Sears Bricker II
The Rev’d Donald Le Roy Irish, SSC
The Rev’d F. Washington Jarvis, L.H.D., D.Litt., OL
Jonathan A. Jensen, Ben.
Charles Owen Johnson, Esq.
Anthony H. Oberdorfer
Phoebe Pettingell
Professor James Robinson Tinsley
James Noël Ward, Ben.
Donald R. Wertz

**American Region, S.K.C.M. – Member Enrollment Anniversaries**
The Listings of Thirty Year Members (SKCM News, June 2011, p. 15) and of Members for more than Thirty Years’ duration (pp. 15-16) are based on surviving copies of the 1974 and 1981 Mailing Lists (EEL), providentially retained by WHS.

*Enrollment dates refer to the calendar year. The fiscal year begins on 1 Oct., so the FY’s 1Q is 4Q of the previously numbered calendar year. Thus, for the first asterisked example, CY1996, its 4Q was 1QFY1997. This is why two years’ reports are consulted for one year’s enrollment anniversaries.*
In the June 2011, SN, ‘Members since 1974’, we accidentally omitted The Rev’d Donne E. Puckl, SSC.

Members for Twenty-five Years
25 Years 1986-2011
No enrollments were recorded in 1986 (EEL)

Members for Twenty Years
20 Years 1991-2011
Based on 1991 Receipts Ledger (MAW)
Mrs. Barbara S. Adams
Bethany Britain
Earl Fain IV
Douglas W. Hoffman
The Rev’d Dr. Richard C. Martin, SSC, OL
Mark Edward Matthews
Kevin R. Rardin
Ralph T. Shower, Jr., TSSF

Members for Fifteen Years
15 Years 1996-2011
Based on 1996/7 Transaction Logs* (WMG)
The Rt. Rev’d Keith L. Ackerman, SSC, D.D.
Capt. Howard S. Browne
The Rev’d Brian Francis Duffy
Howard S. Greene, Sr.
The Most Rev’d Mark Haverland, Ph.D.
The Rt. Rev’d Jack Leo Iker, SSC, D.D.
The Very Rev’d J. Charles King, Ph.D.
The Rev’d Canon R. Brien Koehler, SSC
Michael J. LaCroix
The Rev’d Mark W. & Vickie Lewis
The Rev’d Richardson A. Libby
Kenneth R. Nourse
Daniel Rathbun

The Rev’d Henry G. Turnbull

Members for Ten Years
10 Years 2001-2011
Based on 2003/2 Transaction Logs* (WMG)
Joseph G. Blake
Fred G. Buechner
Dennis A. Corry
Mr. & Mrs. John F. V. Cupschalk
Mark W. Dennehy
William H. Franklin
Hugh G. Hart
Dr. Richard T. Hobgood
Daniel James F. Lula, Esq.
Samuel A. Manka
Dr. Frank J. McCloskey
Colonel James G. McFadden
Joseph D. McLellan, Jr.
Warren Reznicek
Michael P. Ricca
J. Scott

Members for Five Years
5 Years 2006-11
Based on 2006/7 Transaction Logs (WMG)
The Rev’d Michael J. Malone
Philip W. Nielsen
Helen Anderson Pruitt
Roger M. L. Schmitt
David B. Wham
John Arthur Edward Windsor, Ben.

Operational Notices and Features

GOODS ITEMS

The following two updates are incorporated in the 2012 Edition of the ‘Goods Price Sheet and Order Form’, which accompanies the December mailing. Formerly sent with each mailing, its printing cost and the goods trade’s cash flow are not commensurate. The up-to-date price sheet is available on our website and may be printed for reference or use; a hard copy will be sent upon request.

Blessed 1¼” Sterling Medals

At Saint George’s, Windsor, lying on the black marble pavement slab directly above the vault where the Martyr King, Charles I, is interred, the silver medals were blessed by The Rev’d Canon James Woodward on 30 January 2011. On the slab, the incised lettering reads (inter alia),

“King Charles I 1648 [O.S.—Ed.] … This memorial was placed here by command of King William IV, 1837”.
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As Father Swatos, who carried the medals personally, wrote in June, "the medals that now may be purchased [\$90, no P&H] have as reasonably close a connection to the Royal Martyr as we may expect this side of heaven."

Although the blessing entails no added charge, you might include a donation in thanksgiving for the Grace it bears by virtue of its blessing in proximity to the hallowed relic of the Martyr's Body. May your piou devotion be enriched by the medal's presence as you invoke King Charles the Martyr. **Sanctus Carolus, ora pro nobis!**

**All Neckwear Items Are Now Available**

On the Dec. 2010 / 2011 Ed. (Dec. 2011/2012 Ed. Is enclosed in this mailing; more may be printed from website.) of the 'Goods Price List', the Rep Striped Society Neckties and Bow Ties were ruled out to show we were out. They are now in stock and available for purchase.

**Devotional Manual Published**

The Devotional Manual by Drs. Roman and Waonola, is ready. Those members who have waited while theirs have been on back or/feathers on back order will recaem at about the same time as this issue of SN.

**EMAIL COMMUNIQUÉ AND YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS**

Why do we keep asking for your email address? For two reasons. First, it is used as a way to contact you in the not unlikely event we are unable to reach you in the usual way. *i.e.*, your mailing is returned by the U.S.P.S. It is easy to forget to make all necessary address changes at the hectic time of a physical move. One’s email address may remain the same in the midst of many other changes and disruptions. The second reason relates to the Email Communiqué, which started in March 2009. (In case you have missed previous notices, an explanation follows.) It is more frequent than SKCM News and is sent as a pdf file (read using Adobe Reader), attached to an email. Since your name and email address are in the ‘bcc’ field, they are not visible to other recipients. The editor was surprised to find that email addresses are frequently changed. This is one of the factors making the maintenance of the distribution list(s) for the Communiqué tedious, another relates to ‘daemon server’. That demonic device often notifies us that your account is defunct. Later, we may find that there was some minor problem with the account such as a full mailbox. If you do change your email, or change your preference regarding to which of your several email accounts S.K.C.M. email is to be directed, please give us notice. The editor seems never to catch up with all these changes or the entry of new members and appreciates reminders: simply enter as subject, ‘<your surname>/email’, and state your request in the body of the email. For the time being, view the archived issues of the *Email Communiqué* at [www.skcm-usa.org](http://www.skcm-usa.org).

We have received email addresses from fewer than 60% of our members. Surely the proportion having access to the Internet is larger than that. Do you find the Communiqué uninteresting? It is directed toward those with interests in King Charles the Martyr, but it different than SKCM News. For starters, the Communiqué is free. Its content isn’t the same. The main focus of the articles is to present material that you can use when telling an inquirer something about Saint Charles—something that may change his thinking and perhaps influence him to enroll. There are reminders of the Annual Mass and notices of other relevant events.

You may be concerned about the frauds perpetrated using the internet. It is prudent to seek advice before opening anything that is out of the ordinary. Remember that if something looks too good to be true, it likely is. Fretting about security may account for reluctance to use the web. Or you may worry that you will be inundated with daily advertising as with some things to which you might subscribe. Of that, I have experience. We are true to our earlier promise—that is, very, very rarely to send additional notices, and never to share our address lists. You can go onto the web at your public library and view our website to read the Communiqué. You will not receive spam from us.

**ARTICLES IN THIS ISSUE**

In this issue we have a wealth of articles and reviews. I know that the author of an article or review makes a substantial commitment in doing so. Very few writers are able to produce a draft at first sitting that is close to the final version. Was it Eliot’s expectation that, after looking over his typescript of 'The Waste Land', Pound would return it to him, all marked up like that?

In this issue, we have the third article in Abp. Haverland’s series on the Jacobean and Caroline Divine, Henry Hammond. His Grace discuss the puzzling interplay of theology and politics during this period.
We are pleased to have another of Sarah Gilmer Payne’s thought-provoking reviews to intrigue you, the subject so ordinary one’s mind hasn’t dwelt on it—yet potentially it reveals much about the times, opening the inadequately studied subject of people’s daily lives, like ours boring until something goes amiss. To stimulate the imagination the book includes things we know of, but are likely outside our own experience, such as a ‘bookshelf’, really the door to a secret passage, holes for spying, trap doors that may thrill, or kill.

Henrietta Maria’s and King Charles’s relationship was full of stress—he had one of the world’s most impossible jobs, all in his lap, his same-aged siblings absent—one dead, the other in the weakest Palatinate of the Holy Roman Empire, am Rhein, an exile before actual exile—his unfocused, vague father trying to teach him, his mother secretly RC when that was not easy to conceal, Charles took it on and took it seriously, first on his father’s say-so and then, according to an oath (1626). HM had an unwavering love for her church, and was serious, too, ever since the Golden Rose from the Pope arrived before she embarked for Kent. HM (as we may call her) needed no papal gift to strengthen her faith: her mother, Marie de’ Médicis, would strengthen it if required, she learned all the techniques at the breakfast table. Both bride and groom could be called stubborn and immature. They were both from impossible families. Yet they couldn’t help it—they came spontaneously and naturally (and dutifully; each of them believed in duty and accepted its compelling call) to love each other and their children. Canon Barry Swain makes sense of much of this complexity, treating each of the marital partners with appreciation, understanding, sensitivity, and critical scrutiny, all the while having a full comprehension of the historical framework on which the action, and all of the important events and trends of each of them, each other, their family, England, and the European hornets’ nest, lie. There are many story-lines that could provide bases for scores of historical novels, and Father Swain discerns their impact on each other and their influence on outcomes of importance.

Prince Charles was only eleven when his older brother Henry, whom he admired, died of typhoid in 1612. Charles was chief mourner at Henry’s funeral. The next year, at age twelve, he was honored to serve as best man at his older sister Elizabeth’s marriage to Frederick V, elector Palatine on Rhine, in the Chapel Royal of Whitehall Palace—an honor yet a loss—he never saw Elizabeth again, although their correspondence, until his death, was regular and frequent. Then, in 1618, Charles’s mother Anne died; he was 17 and again a chief mourner. The two were close, even when he was a small child, unusual among the Royals then and still. Anne bequeathed her estate to Charles, as had Henry.*

Frederick became King of Bohemia and Elizabeth, his Queen, but their tenure in Bohemia was of limited duration, for which reason they lived in exile in Holland and became known as the ‘Winter King’ and ‘Winter Queen’. Society members will know Prince Rupert, their son, better than the others of this branch of the family; it may be noted, if you search for some images, that the two of them, Prince Rupert and his mother, bear a very strong resemblance. The dynasty of the family is the House of Wittelsbach-Simmern, or the House of Hanover.

Dr. Suzanne G. Bowles has reviewed a new biography of Sophia of Hanover,** one of Rupert’s sisters, the remarkably intelligent and exceptionally talented daughters of the Winter King and Queen. With them, Sophia lived in exile in Holland—the Hague and Leiden. The Winter King and Queen maintained a court of great reserve. Sophia was highly literate, spoke six languages, excelled in mathematics, music, and was artistic. A picture of her accompanies Dr. Bowles’s review; her appearance is very striking. She looks to be confident and self-possessed, as she was. It will become apparent from the review that Sophia of Hanover displayed excellent judgment throughout her life. King Charles I, her uncle, would have been proud. It was this Sophia on whom the Crown was ‘settled’ by the 1701 Act of Settlement.

Another Sophia, Sophia of Hanover’s daughter-in-law, called Sophia Dorothea (Sophia of Celle), was King George I’s wife and King George II’s mother. She was rebellious, and showed it, e.g., when told of various ‘suitable’ arranged marriage options, including, the then future king of Denmark and the duke of Wolfenbüttel. Her parents finally informed her that it would be best to marry her cousin, George Louis—on the day before her engagement to the Duke was set to be announced! She hurled a miniature of her future husband given by Duchess Sophia (of Hanover) against the wall, exclaiming, “I will not marry the pig-snout”, the future King George’s nickname that was shouted as a taunt when he passed through the streets of Hanover. Why was she
imprisoned in a castle for thirty of her sixty years? **Mr. John A. E. Windsor** has commented on a biography of 'Sophie' Dorothea for this issue, providing a perfect complement to the review by Dr. Bowles.

Another no less complex volume of which Mr. Windsor made a study, a recent biography of Jane Boleyn, goes back two hundred years from the Sophias and Georges to the Tudor Dynasty. It was about a century from Henry's birth (1491) and accession (1509), to Charles I's birth in 1600 and James I's accession in 1603, and from then, a little more than a century until 'Good' Queen Anne died in 1714, triggering the Settlement of the Crown as had been stipulated in 1701. We are at once reminded of a favorite Society hymn, the stirring 'Lord, let the strain arise' (Vs. 4):

A century before
Great Charles was called to die,
A sinful king laid waste the Church—
Angered our God on high.

The fire of Heaven's wrath
Waxed hotly more and more;
Until thy Royal blood, O Saint,
Cancelled the sin of yore.

(*lyrics by Father Ignatius, [Joseph Leycester Lyne]; suggested tune, 'Diademata', Hymnal 1940, No. 352*)

The subject of this review is a recent biography of Lady Rockford, Jane Boleyn, the wife of Anne Boleyn's brother, George Viscount Boleyn, Lord Rockford. Lady Rockford was, to say the least, proficient at intrigue; she set up others for quick removal from the land of the living. Most notoriously, she gave evidence against her sister-in-law (the Queen, Anne Boleyn) and *her own husband* (the Queen's brother, George). Both he and the Queen were executed. There were trials where the accused and several witnesses all testified, but there were false depositions and shameless lying in court. In some cases the King dictated, merely to avoid embarrassment, that certain witnesses were not to testify. In one particular trial, Henry wanted to make sure his own poor sexual performance was not revealed. The courts had no choice but to acquiesce.

A judge had quite a lot of power in his courtroom, but King Henry exerted supreme power over axe and chopping block, and he had shown that he meant business. *Recall what happened to his Chancellor, Sir [later Saint] Thomas More.* One must say that Henry created a more credible semblance of a proper trial than Oliver Cromwell, not everyone has the same name, and the business can be followed without constantly referring to a cheat sheet, such as helps when reading a Russian novel, with all those patronyms, diminutives, and nicknames, or even English history with a noble character's title ever changing as his ingratiation efforts succeed, all taking place on the backdrop of ever-changing lovers, triangles, infidelities so common that they are unremarkable, all taking place in an environment of secrecy, scheming, deception, gossip, and ' overhearing'. The biography of Lady Rockford provides a way of observing and understanding Henry VIII. He played the same game as his courtiers, sinking to their level. No one told him how to behave: *Dieu et mon droit* had been distorted. Much of it is perplexing; what was planned, or lies pure and simple, or the result of chance? If we zoom in on Lady Rockford or on King Henry, we see many possible motives—the usual—selfishness, jealousy, and revenge, but neither they nor Mr. Windsor's clear explanations of the characters' backgrounds and their alliances, affairs, and antagonisms reveal full answers—some died with them. There are many possibilities. Individual interactions and geopolitics are factors. None of the participants is simple, yet each thing that is done is simple and its motives are easily understood. But many details are unknown—never revealed or covered with lies.

For the editor, the insight granted by the book, which is ostensibly about Lady Rockford, and by Mr. Windsor's explication of it, is *derived* from a deeper knowledge and understanding of Henry's reign, yet in a circular fashion also *leads* to deeper knowledge and understanding of it. Even from the better historians we often get an 'off with his head, off with her head' superficiality driven by Henry's obsessive quest for a male heir. But usual histories do not bring us their *reality*, the ordinary, frequent, day-to-day sexual interactions. They are common, many are sexual, all are easily understood, but they are complex because they are so numerous and geometrically advanced—triangles, quadrilaterals, pentagons, and up, crisscrossed with lines connecting non-adjacent vertices. Perhaps their description would be better described in three-dimensions.

Jane Seymour was favored by Henry among his queens—she bore him an heir, the feeble Edward VI. She died, less than two weeks later, in 1537, and was the first to be interred in the vaults of Saint George's, Windsor, in a royal vault. Her demise provides the supreme example of Henry's selfishness: her death was hardly
noticed, amidst all the rejoicing over an heir. Ten years later, the remains of Henry VIII were placed in the same vault. His remains were disturbed at some time—a number of theories have been proposed, one, that the corpulent king’s rotting corpse caused the lead coffin to burst again, as it had before interment, another, that it was crudely opened for some reason, vandalism, robbery, or to mutilate the cadaver, and another, popularly held, that Queen Mary I (‘Bloody Mary’) had the coffin opened and the body reduced to ashes to eradicate the syphilis with which Henry had infected his offspring. The vault itself bore evidence of a break-in, loose brick and masonry that before had been cemented tightly with mortar. A century and two years after the interment of Henry VIII, those hastily interning King Charles I placed his leaden coffin in this vault.

* Several times over the centuries, Danish blood has mingled with the British Royal blood, as with the present Queen and her consort Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, formerly Prince of the Hellenes and Prince of Denmark. Protracted revolutionary unrest (royalists/rightists vs. socialists/communists) led to ousting the government in 1973, there were a plebiscite and a junta. The latter forced Prince Philip’s grandfather, King Constantine II of the Hellenes, to abdicate in 1974, Constantine II’s mother was Princess Frederika of Hanover, he married Anne-Marie of Denmark, sister of the present Danish Queen. Constantine was an Olympic gold medalist in sailing (1960 Summer Games, Rome); he lives near London and is a friend of Prince Charles, his second cousin: Charles’s grandfather, Prince Andrew of Greece (Prince Philip’s father) and Constantine’s grandfather, King Constantine I of Greece, were brothers. Constantine is second cousin once removed to Prince William, Duke of Cambridge, his godson. And Constantine and Queen Elizabeth II are third cousins: both are great-great-grandchildren of Christian IX of Denmark (she through Queen Alexandra, consort of Edward VII) and also of Queen Victoria, Constantine through his grandmother, Queen Sophia, daughter of Victoria, Princess Royal. If like the editor’s eyes yours have glazed over, you’ll be able to follow this: Constantine, an honorary member of the International Olympic Committee, presented the silver medals in Beijing (2008).

**Sophia of Hanover was cousin to Ernest Augustus, Elector of Brunswick-Lüneburg (he became the First Elector thereof in 1692; cf also Dr. Bowles’s review on his acquisition of the Electoral dignity); they married in . Ernest Augustus and Elizabeth Stuart were second cousins, both being great grandchildren of Christian III of Denmark.

ERRATA AND ADDENDA

Abbreviations to be used henceforth, unitalicized: SKCM News (SN), ‘Editor’s Miscellany’ (EM), ‘Tangential Topics’ (TT), Email Communiqué (EC), Church and King (C&K), The White King (WK).

Many style guides now suggest using only a number in parentheses to cite a page number. Without ‘p.’ or ‘pp.’, a number alone may be ambiguous as context varies and for the non-specialist reader.

SKCM News (SN), December 2010

p. 6, ¶3, end of line 1. Missing page number is 57.

p. 7, bottom right, text box. Lines 1 and 2 should be closer together, and the title “LEGEND”, within the text box.

‘Summary of Donations’, p. 17, top right. The corrected numbers are $2,470, 1,300, 1,573, and $5,343.

Review of ‘Anglo-Catholic...’ p. 26, 1st full ¶, and throughout. “George Early” should read “George Every”.

Article, ‘The Rule of Twenty-Four’. p. 40, last sentence before ‘Conclusion’. Poe’s middle name was ‘Allan’, not ‘Allen’.

Inside back cover, ¼ of the way down, where “December, 2009” appears, it should read “December, 2010”.

SKCM News (SN), June 2011

p. 1, line 4 and p. 2, line 4 are the origins of footnotes ‘1’ and ‘b’, on p. 4 the footnotes appear more harmoniously as ‘1)’ and ‘2)’. Their form should have been consistent.

p. 4, line 5, “Observe...”. Our suggestion, the majority and substance of which was regretfully omitted, was intended to encourage celebrations in 2011 and 2012 to give thanks for England’s, the C of E’s, and the Stuart Dynasty’s unmatched contributions to the English language by commemorating the Quatercentenary (2011) of the Authorized Version of The Bible and the Semiseptcentenary (2012) of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer.

Our use of the term ‘quatercentenary’ (400th anniversary) has been the subject of discussion, not to say criticism. (At a glance it may be seen as a typographical error, dropping an R from ‘quarter’). In such nomenclature, ‘quadrij’ may also denote four, as in quadrennial. ‘Quarter’ is not used, ‘quarto’ occasionally is, but ‘hemisemi’ or ‘demisemi’ more often are, as in ‘demiseptcentennial’ for a 175th anniversary... A ‘quaternity’ is something of ‘four’; in medieval times there were many, the four elements of alchemy (earth, air, fire, and water), the four seasons, the four humors, the four compass points, four winds, and many more fours were adopted in Christianity giving us the four Eastern doctors of the church and the four Western doctors, and so on. A four-line poem is a quatrains, and a quart, a fourth of a gallon, and a quarter, 25 cents, a quarter of a dollar. When words come into common usage as jargon or slang they may be changed, or corrupted. In mechanics, e.g., a
Jesu, Mercy!  ❧  Requiescant in pace  ❧  Mary, Pray!

NOTICES OF DEATH

The Rev’d Canon Donald Le Roy Irish, SSC, Enrolled in 1974*, Obit. 28 Jan. 2011, Aet. 84
Anita Graf (Mrs. Elijah) White, Obit. 6 June 2010, Aet. 70

SECRETARY/TREASURER 1986-2006 – ROYAL MARTYR CHURCH UNION

W. Ronald C. Miller, W.S., Baron of Pittenweem, Obit. 28 June 2011, Aet. 92 (p. 9)

* or earlier. Because of our poor records, an enrollment date in the 70s is seldom known with certainty, and before that, is seldom known at all.

OBITUARIES†

The Rev’d Canon Roger Jack Bunday, Ph.D., of Milwaukee, died 26 Feb. 2011, age 91. Born in Northfield MN, he earned the M.Div. (Seabury-Western, 1945) and was ordained deacon and priest in April and December of 1945. He served parishes in MN, MI, and WI, starting with three little Minnesota missions between Duluth and St. Paul, and continuing his ministry in MI at St. Mark’s, Paw Paw and S. John’s, Ionia. He became rector of St. Alban’s, Marshfield WI, in 1960. Then, two decades after his ordination, he went to graduate school, earning the M.A. and Ph.D. at U. WI Madison in 1968 and 1974, respectively. WI. One of our nonagenarian members, he celebrated his 65th Anniversary of Ordination just last year, on 21 Dec. 2010. He was rector of Saint Andrew’s, Emporia KS (1972-84). In retirement, Dr. Bunday served at All SS. Cathedral, Milwaukee, where he was honored with his canonize in 2008. Dr. Bunday was physically active and mentally agile, well-schooled, very inquisitive, and keenly interested in King Charles and the work of our Society. We spoke annually at Nashotah House, where he attended Commencement and Alumni Day regularly. He made a large bequest to the cathedral in Milwaukee. He was as modest about mentioning his doctorate as he was assertive that his middle name, Jack, should appear.

The Rev’d Dr. Ronald Parks Conner, of Washington DC, died on 30 Jan. 2011 and was buried from Saint Columba’s Church. He carried out his undergraduate studies at the Univ. of the South (B.A. 1967) and his
Theological studies at General (S.T.B., 1970; S.T.M., 1971). He was ordained deacon and priest in June and December, 1970; his 40th Ordination Anniversaries fell last year, 2010. He earned two doctorates, the D.Min. (XX, 1982) and the Th.D. (Boston Univ., 2003). One of our members who resides in the District commented on the fine quality of Dr. Conner's sermons, and reported attending them not only at Ascension & S. Agnes, where for many years Dr. Conner served as Assisting Priest (as when A&SA hosted our Annual Mass in 2000), but at other local churches at which he was a supply priest. Father Conner served as Rector of S. Stephen's, Providence (1971-79). That parish's setting, right on the campus of Brown Univ., suited his academic bent.

The Rev'd Canon Donald L. Irish, SSC, a life member, died on 28 Jan. 2011, age 84, in Boulder City NV, where he had worked with Fr. Herbert Ward, director of Saint Jude’s Ranch (a Society member, too). In 2008, Father Irish celebrated the 55th Anniversary of his priestly ordination. Father Irish graduated from General in 1951 served briefly at S. Andrew’s, Elsinore CA until called 'back East' to be rector of historic Saint Paul’s, Clinton & Carroll Sts., Brooklyn (1953-81). After retiring, he became a missionary in the Dominican Republic (1983-98). He delighted in sending reports of his celebration of 30 January noting that it was perhaps our only celebration in Spanish and the only mass of S. Charles in Latin America, too. Although Life Members are not required to pay dues, he made an annual donation and wrote in twice a year with updates on his activities and and reporting a little on things on Hispaniola. We will miss this dedicated priest, who was committed to keeping in touch with his Society. He told the story of King Charles the Martyr wherever he was.

Anita Graf White, 70, died on 6 June 2010 at her farm near Hamilton VA. Born in Cincinnati, she graduated from The Seven Hills and The Madeira Schools and Vassar College. She then settled in Loudoun County VA for its way of life and equestrian opportunities. In 1970, she was elected Master of Foxhounds of the Loudoun Hunt and continued for 35 years until prevented by hip problems. For twenty of those years, she took the field rain or shine, four times a week, seven months a year. Mrs. White showed, bred, and trained thoroughbreds and actively competed in three-day eventing. At its 1959 organizational meeting, she was Secretary of the U.S. Combined Training Assn., keeping the points for several years, a founding member of the Oatlands Equestrian Ctr., and of Loudoun Therapeutic Riding for the Handicapped. She was Chairman of the Board the last three years of her 25 as a Director of Oatlands of the Natl. Trust. In addition, she served as Treasurer of Our Saviour, Oatlands 1972-97. Her husband, The Rev'd Elijah White, survives her, as do a sister, a brother, two step-daughters, cousins, and nieces and nephews unto the second and third generations.

*The Obituaries of Fr. Bunday and Fr. Irish draw significantly from those in *The Anglican Digest*, whose editors we thank.*
IN RECOGNITION OF THE CULT OF CHARLES
Sermon by The Rev’d Canon J. Robert Wright, D.Phil. (Oxon.),
Saint Mark’s-in-the-Bowery Professor of Ecclesiastical History
in The General Theological Seminary and Historiographer of the Episcopal Church.

Preached at Solemn High Mass of the Society of King Charles the Martyr
7 May 2011 at the Church of the Resurrection, New York City

"Do not be ashamed then of testifying to our Lord, nor [of being] his prisoner, but take your share of
suffering for the gospel in the power of God, who saved us and called us with a holy calling, not in virtue of our
works but in virtue of his own purpose and the grace which he gave us in Christ Jesus." 2 Timothy 1: 8-9.

Let me first thank my esteemed former student and fellow priest for the courtesy of this pulpit.
We are gathered in this Solemn Mass to continue the same testimony to which Scripture calls us—
today to celebrate and commemorate the 350th anniversary of the recognition of the cultus of King
Charles the Martyr. Cultus, or cult, in this context means official veneration—the technical terms in
catholic theology being dulia (or proskynesis), as contrasted to latria, the worship that is due to God
alone. The historical event for which we give thanks is the authorization, or unanimous approval by
the Convocations of Canterbury and York in the Church of England on 26 April 1661, that established
the so-called “State Services” or special liturgical prayers for Charles on 30 January to be inserted into
that which would become in the following year the official Book of Common Prayer of 1662. This was
and is the official recognition of his cultus. The copy of this Prayer Book in my personal collection,
printed at Cambridge in 1662, shows 50 lovely illustrations and its text frequently refers to our
beloved Charles as “saint” and “martyr.” It also displays some 67 black letter saints’ days as well as
the “Oath of the King’s Sovereignty” that was thereafter included within the Ordinal which then
became formally incorporated within the Prayer Book itself. I am proud to say that the pages of my
copy show their greatest ancient wear at the Communion Service, thus indicating the priorities of its
eyear owners in that happy period of the Restoration.

At the outset of my remarks today, though, I pause to ask, why is it that we who are Anglicans,
whether in America or in England or elsewhere in the world, and under whatsoever institutional
affiliation or name—why is it that we who are Anglicans are so reticent in joining our voices in a
celebration of this sort? Is our reticence, our hesitation, merely a continuing effect of the English
reformation, that “great mistake” so to say, which is the lingering trace of protestantism that still
affects us? Or is it some English-ness, some innate reserve in matters of religion, that holds us back
from outward expression, that make us so stingy in our willingness to name saints and to celebrate
their cultus? Most of us have recently observed, on television or in newspapers, the beatification
process whereby Pope Benedict proclaimed John Paul II as blessed. Benedict has already beatified
some 790 people and canonized some 34 saints, and his predecessor John Paul II beatified more than
1,300 persons and canonized 482. Now it is true that we as Anglicans do not have so elaborate and
legalistic a process as prevails in the Roman Church, but in comparison therefore we should be less
stingy in proclaiming saints, and not bound to so complex a set of rules. What holds us back, what
restrains us from celebrating before the world the contributions we inherit especially from the Stuart
dynasty, such as the legacies of the King James Bible whose anniversary we should have been proudly
celebrating this very year, or the 1662 Book of Common Prayer whose 350th comes up in 2012, so
proudly defended by Charles himself, or the retention of church government by Bishops in Apostolic
Succession, now enshrined in the fourth point of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, for which also Charles gave his life and was contented to be betrayed by wicked men? We do defend the early church and the early ecumenical councils in our dialogues with other churches and they are studied in some of our seminaries, but why then are we not more adamant, as my friend the historian Colin Podmore has recently asked, in defending the rest of our catholic heritage? Why then is not the date of 30 January marked by a gold star in our Anglican calendars, and why are we not more widely and openly grateful for the Historic Episcopate and the Book of Common Prayer on this day as well?

As we reflect upon this cultus today and what it means, I want to share with you in part some things I have already spoken before on an occasion of this sort, and I also want to share with you, to quote for you in conclusion from my own research, some little known words of Charles himself. This King who we call Charles the Martyr (d. 1649) was commemorated in the Prayer Book of the Church of England from 1662 to 1859, then he was dropped for reasons about which historians do not totally agree. He never quite made it to the first American Prayer Book of 1789-90 because of our country’s need for distance from monarchy at that time. Whether or not the Queen’s Printers had statutory authority to remove his name from the English Kalendar in 1859 when the State Services were terminated, he did finally re-enter an official English liturgical calendar in 1980 with the publication of the Alternative Service Book of the Church of England in that year. Of course he has now entered the calendars of some other Anglican churches throughout the world, such as Canada. But most remarkable of all is the fact in this XXI Century post-deconstructionist world of searches for identity, that Charles as “King and Martyr” has been clearly and explicitly retained in the new calendar of the very modern Common Worship volume of the Church of England, just published in the year 2000. I do not find him, however, among the hundreds of names in our new “Holy Women, Holy Men” book proposed for our own church. Whatever the word “martyr” may mean, and there are various acceptable definitions, the modern-day Church of England clearly recognizes him as a “martyr”. Remarkably as I say, the commemoration of King Charles the Martyr is on the rise, even in official circles, in liturgical calendars, in special services, in shrines and memorials, and in other ways. There is a growing realization that he is part of who we are as Anglicans, even in the Episcopal Church if not yet at the official level. In addition to the long-standing witness of the Society of King Charles the Martyr and other groups, The Anglican Society, which I serve as President, has by official action of its Executive Committee resolved to work for the addition of his name to the calendar of The Episcopal Church.

Why should there be an official recognition of his cultus? Charles could have avoided martyrdom if he had agreed to give up his witness to the catholic faith and order that is an essential ingredient of classical Anglicanism, in particular if he had agreed to settle for a church without bishops. Never have I felt his prayers and intercessions, his patience and determination, more personally than when I represented the Episcopal Church in our dealings with the Lutherans over the Concordat of Agreement and then the Called to Common Mission. By the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886-88, the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion are committed to the historic episcopate, and by action of our General Convention we even hold that it is “essential to the reunion of the church.” But the term itself, “historic episcopate,” we must admit, is not one that Charles would have known, any more than many of us would be prepared to defend every aspect of monarchy that he believed was integral to episcopacy as he knew it. There has to be a substance of episcopacy that can be distinguished from the accidents and incidentals that have accrued to it over time and history, and only upon its “absolutely essential features,” its “first principles,” as William Reed Huntington the
Quadrilateral’s author said, must we take our stand. Indeed there is no secret that one of the major Lutheran misunderstandings of us had been their perception that when we speak of episcopacy we presume the entire British church-state establishment as it has lingered on in England. But neither can we assume that the form in which we hold it in the Episcopal Church today is the only form of episcopacy that is consonant with the Gospel, when, after all, the majority of the world’s Christians in churches having the historic episcopate insist that it must be restricted to celibates who are male. This is the position, let us not forget, of the Roman Catholics and the Eastern Orthodox. On the other hand, “The bishop must be the husband of one wife,” we read clearly in 1 Timothy 3: 14, but does that mean that no celibate can be a bishop, or that no-one divorced and re-married can be a bishop, or—in apparent contradiction of 1 Peter 2: 25—that Jesus Christ was not a bishop because he was not the husband of one wife? These are some of the problems that arise when neo-fundamentalism is asserted in some churches that think they are better off by breaking away from the Anglican mainstream. And let us consider further. Must not the episcopacy, the truly “historic” episcopate, include the papal primacy, as even some Anglicans have argued? There is a Roman Catholic form of the historic episcopate, an Eastern Orthodox form, and now a Lutheran form of it in this country, which, again, is somewhat different from our own. Anglicanism today, Anglicanism in the time of King Charles I and Archbishop Laud, did not and does not have sole proprietary right to define the meaning of episcopacy.

From the time of the New Testament onwards, there has been room for much diversity of incidentals in different understandings of how episcopacy relates to the Gospel, but one thing is certain: Charles I, King of England and Scotland, gave his life for it on 30 January 1649. For those of us who struggle to define it and defend it still today, for every true Anglican, he is in this sense our patron. In devotional language, we can be confident that we have his prayers on our behalf at the throne of Grace. He was ready, as Scripture says, to give account to anyone who asks a reason for the hope that was within him—with gentleness and reverence, and so must we. He was not ashamed to testify before the Lord. As Episcopalians, as Anglicans, we do not seek to unchurch or unchristianize those churches not yet standing in the historic episcopacy, but it is our conviction, displayed on pages 876-878 of the Prayer Book 1979 and endorsed by action of our General Convention, that the historic episcopate, in its substance although not in incidentals, is essential to the reunion of the church. It too is part of the hope that is within us. It is a treasure that we seek to share, not one that we possess exclusively. The historic episcopacy is not the Gospel, but it is very closely tied to the witness and proclamation of the Gospel, as the late Archbishop Michael Ramsey was known to say.¹

Let us think back in history to the situation in England that Charles faced in the years immediately preceding his beheading in 1649, as he was being spirited from place to place in varying degrees of confinement under guard. A civil war was under way, there was the Solemn League and Covenant, and the Westminster Assembly appointed by the Long Parliament had drawn up a very thin book published in 1645 entitled, A Directory for the Publique Worship of God, mostly containing exhortatory suggestions rather than set formulations, and certainly nothing like an Ordinal for the transmission of the threefold ministry. Printed at the very beginning of that little volume (of which I own a copy), was the ordinance of the Long Parliament passed on 3 January 1645, the very day that Archbishop Laud was condemned to die for treason. That ordinance, sad to say, was entitled “For the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer,” and by that ordinance the Book that had defined classical Anglicanism since 1549 was abolished and any use of it thereafter was made a penal offense. “The said Book of Common Prayer,” it decreed, “shall not remain, or be from henceforth used, in any church, chappell, or
place of public worship within the kingdom of England or dominion of Wales.” That Directory declares that there are to be no festivals or holy days apart from the Lord’s Day, and thus it contains no seasonal prayers or calendar of the church year at all. Even Christmas, for example, is no longer kept. Church buildings may continue to be used for public worship, but they possess no sanctity in themselves. Bowing or any other external adoration is forbidden. Even the text of the Lord’s Prayer is not printed, and if used it is to be recited by the minister alone. Apart from the metrical psalms there is nothing for the people to say, not even the litany. At the burial of the dead there are to be no prayers or ceremonies of any sort, only silence. My friends, it was against those directions, which continued to be mandatory from 1645 until the Restoration on 29 May 1660, that Charles resisted until his beheading on 30 January 1649. It was one thing to hold, as Richard Hooker had emphasized for Anglicans, that anything could be said or done in worship so long as it was “not contrary to the Word of God” as interpreted by antiquity and reason, but quite another thing to demand, as did the Directory and most Puritans and still some of their free-church descendants today, that nothing can be said or done that was not explicitly required in Scripture. Against that directory and in that context, King Charles Stuart gave his life as a martyr for classical Anglican identity, for Anglican orders, for Anglican spirituality, for Anglican polity, for Anglican mission—for the Anglican understanding of the implications of the Gospel. He died pointing to the Lord, to the Gospel, to the apostolic and catholic tradition that Anglicans have received and still try, in our own very different world, to proclaim. Charles stood ready, as the Scripture says, always to give account to anyone who asks a reason for the hope that is within. He did it with gentleness and reverence, and that cost his life.

Let us listen in conclusion to Charles’s response to that Directory, his firm and humble response, for which, shortly thereafter, his life was demanded of him:

"Whereas by a Printed Paper, dated the third of January last past, intituled, An Ordinance of Parliament for taking away the Book of Common-Prayer, and for establishing and putting in execution of the Directory for the publique worship of God; It is said to be ordained among other things, That the Book of Common-Prayer should not remain, or be from thenceforth used in any Church, Chappell, or place of publique Worship within the Kingdome of England or Dominion of Wales; And that the Directory for publique Worship in that printed Paper set forth, should be from thenceforth used, pursued, and observed in all exercises of publique Worship of God in every Congregation, Church, Chappell, and place of publique Worship. And by another printed Paper, dated the 23.day of August last past, intituled, An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, for the more effectual putting in execution the Directory for publique Worship, etc. particular directions are set down for the dispersing, publishing, and use of the said Directory, in all parishes, Chappelries, and Donatives, and for the calling in and suppressing of all Books of Common-Prayer, under several forfeitures and penalties to be levied and imposed upon conviction before Justices of Assize, or of Oyer and Terminer, and of the Peace, as by the said two printed Papers may appeare. And taking into Our consideration, that the Book of Common Prayer, which is endeavoured thus to be abolished, was compiled in the times of Reformation, by the most learned and pious men of that Age, and defended and confirmed with the Martyrdom of many; and was first established by Act of Parliament in the time of King Edward the sixth, and never repealed or laid aside, save only in that short time of Queen Maries Reign, upon the returne of Popery and superstition; and in the first yeare of Queen Elizabeth, it was again revived and established by Act of Parliament, and by the repeale of it then declared by the whole Parliament, to have been to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the Professors of the truth of Christs Religion: and ever since it hath been used and observed for above fourscore years together, in the best times of peace and plenty that ever this Kingdome enjoyed, and that it conteines in it an excellent Forme of Worship and Service of God, grounded upon holy Scriptures, and is a singular meanes and helpe to devotion in all Congregations, and that, or some other of the like Forme, simply necessary in those many Congregations, which cannot be
otherwise supplied by learned and able men, and keeps up an uniformity in the Church of England; And that the Directory, which is sought to be introduced, is a meanes to open the way, and give the liberty to all ignorant factious or evil men, to broach their own fancies and conceits, be they never so wicked and erroneous; and to mislead People into sin and Rebellion, and to utter those things, even in that which they make for their Prayer in their Congregations as in Gods presence, which no conscientious man can assent or say Amen to. And be the Minister never so pious and religious, yet it will breake that uniformity which hitherto hath been held in Gods service, and be a means to raise Faction and divisions in the Church; And those many Congregations in this Kingdome, where able and religious Ministers cannot be maintained, must be left destitute of all helpe or meanes for their publique worship and service of God: And observing likewise, that no reason is given for this alteration, but only inconvenience alleged . . . And taking into Our further consideration, that this alteration is introduced by colour of Ordinances of Parliament, made without and against Our consent, and against an expresse Act of Parliament still in force, and the same Ordinances made as perpetuall binding Lawes, inflicting penalties and punishments, which was never, before these times, so much as pretended to have been the use or power of Ordinances of Parliament, without an expresse Act of Parliament, to which Wee are to be parties.

"Now lest Our silence should be interpreted by some as a connivance or indifferency in Us, in a manner so highly concerning the Worship and Service of God, the Peace and Unity of the Church and State, and the establish’d Lawes of the Kingdome, Wee have therefore thought fit to publish this Our Proclamation; And Wee do hereby require and command all and singular Ministers in all Cathedrall and Parish-Churches, and other places of publique Worship, within Our Kingdome of England or Dominion of Wales; and all other to whom it shall appertaine, that the said Booke of Common-Prayer be kept and used in all Churches, Chappells, and places of publique Worship, according to the said Statute made in that behalfe in the said first yeare of the said late Queen Elizabeth; And that the said Directory be in no sort admitted, received, or used, the said pretended Ordinances, or any thing in them conteined to the contrary notwithstanding. And Wee do hereby let them know, that whensoever it shall please God to restore Us to Peace, and the Lawes to their due course (wherein Wee doubt not of his assistance in his good time) Wee shall require a strict account and prosecution against the breakers of the said Law, according to the force thereof. And in the meane time, in such places where Wee shall come, and find the Booke of Common-Prayer supprest and laid aside, and the Directory introduced, Wee shall account all those that shall be ayders, actors or contrivers therein, to be persons disaffected to the Religion and Lawes established: and this they must expect, besides that greater loss which they shall sustain by suffering themselves thus to be deprived of the use and comfort of the said Booke. Given at Our Court at Oxford this thirteenth day of November, in the one and twentieth yeare of Our Raigne. 1645."

These are the words of Charles, the public recognition of whose cultus we commemorate today. And why should we not celebrate his life that he gave in defense of the Book of Common Prayer and of the Historic Episcopal Succession? In modern terms, this legacy has well been described by the historian Kenneth Hyolson-Smith as "an example in faith and conduct of that Churchmansion which emphasizes catholicity: continuity with and descent from Christ and his Apostles; the central importance in the life of the Church of episcopacy; a deep concern that the worship of the Church should be of prime importance in the life of the Church, and should be conducted with reverence and awe; a focus on the altar, in churches furnished and adorned in such a way as to enhance the beauty of holiness and stimulate worship; the centrality of the sacraments, and a doctrine of the Eucharist which stresses the [real] presence of Christ." Who would deny that these are major emphases we want to stress in the Episcopal Church today, that they are derived from our understanding of the Gospel for our day, that these are catholic privileges to which we believe every Anglican should have equal access regardless of race or color or sex or social background or nationality or political party? In affirming Charles’s sacrificial self-commitment to classical
catholic Anglican Christianity, we “remember” as Charles asked us to do, and thus we underscore the cost of discipleship, even unto death, while at the same time we add clarity to the profile of Anglican identity. And such clarity is of vital importance not only to our worship but also to our evangelism and mission. For good reason the Church of England has restored Charles Stuart, martyr, to its official calendar of saints, and so should we. Let us rejoice to join in the official recognition of his cultus today. So integral is he to our self-understanding of who we are as Anglicans and of what we offer, that we too may say, and should say, with all the company of heaven: ‘Holy Charles Stuart, King and Martyr, pray for us!’

Passive Obedience and Caroline Politics. II

Continued from our 4 June 2011 issue; to be concluded in June 2012 issue.

by The Most Rev’d Mark Haverland, Ph.D.

C. FURTHER ARGUMENTS AGAINST RESISTANCE

In three short tracts following Of Resisting the lawfull Magistrate, Hammond answers Biblical objections to his main thesis. The first of these three is called Of the word KPIMA. ‘Krima’ occurs in Romans xiii: 2, a locus classicus of New Testament teaching on civil authority. The Authorized Version translates this verse as follows:

Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

‘Damnation’ renders ‘krima’ in this version; however, Hammond admits that ‘krima’ literally means ‘censure’ or ‘judgement.’

The difficulty lies in determining the nature of this judgement. Hammond holds that Romans xiii: 2 predicts both human and divine punishments for resistance. Hammond’s opponents hold that it includes a mere temporal multct; that is, that resistance leads naturally to punishment from the one resisted, but that this does not necessarily imply divine disapproval. To this opposition Hammond responds that verse 5 (‘be subject...also for conscience sake’) clearly implies divine judgement: ‘Krima’ means ‘Gods retribution or payment or rending according to Works.’<sup>27</sup> It follows that disobedience is a work that will receive a divine ‘krima,’ which will be damnation, unless there is some

. . . antidote of invincible ignorance or weakness, [or] recovery by repentance, [or] gracious pardon of God in not imputing some single act of it. . .<sup>28</sup>

Temporal punishment may come to the disobedient also, perhaps as a spur to the conscience to save the disobedient from eternal punishment by leading him to repentance. But even such temporal ills are part of divine judgement.

Hammond’s tract called A Vindication of Christ’s reprehending Saint Peter, from the Exceptions of Mr. MARSHAL also shores up his Biblical argument for passive obedience. Marshall argued that Christ reproved Peter for the use of a sword, not because Peter used force against injustice, but because Peter misused defence in a particular case. To support his case Marshall cited Grotius and several Fathers. Hammond begins his response by showing that Marshall abused his authorities. Grotius, for instance, according to Hammond, far from permitting resistance, held it unlawful to war against the magistrate, even according to ‘the very Law of Nature (so much now talkt of)’ and much more according to the law of the Gospel. The only occasions on which Grotius would permit war against the magistrate, as when the king has abdicated and then attacks others, do nothing to support
Marshall’s position<sup>29</sup>. Hammond says that Marshall has found the Philosopher’s stone if he thinks that the men he cites support his position.

Hammond concludes that Christ did indeed rebuke Peter’s zeal, a Jewish zeal abolished by the Gospel<sup>30</sup>. To rebel against the king, the ‘Supreme Master in earth, the meer-humane Christ, the Lords anointed,’ is wrong. Therefore, Hammond commands the subject’s sword to return to its sheath, and adds, ‘I wish to GOD it would obey the command.’<sup>31</sup> Here Hammond is rehearsing a familiar Anglican theme: Andrewes and others had long used the Psalm verse, ‘Touch not mine anointed,’ Psalm cv: 15, to support non-resistance and respect for royal authority<sup>32</sup>.

The two short tracts just considered seem to be defensive in nature, designed to protect two of Hammond’s chief Biblical supports. The next one, Of the Zealots among the Jewes, and the Liberty taken by them, is offensive, designed to undermine texts used by Hammond’s opponents. By ‘zealot’ Hammond means a private man among the Jews, who, led by zeal, punishes malefactors without normal process of law. The example of such private actions, sometimes taken even against a public authority, was of obvious use to the Parliament men. The burden of Hammond’s argument is that legitimate instances of zealotry are confined to Old Testament times, or, in the case of the Maccabees, to inter-testamental times, and that Christ put an end to them.

Mattathias in the First Book of Maccabees (ii: 54, 58) calls Phinehas (cf. Numbers xxv: 7) and Elijah ‘zealots’ for the Law. Such examples explain cases in the New Testament in which Jews act without legal process, as when the priests have Christ or the apostles smitten, when the scribes fear sudden stoning (Luke xx: 6), or when Stephen is stoned. Many interpreters, Hammond says, explain that these actions are taken jure Zelotarum<sup>33</sup>.

According to Hammond all zealous acts in the New Testament, with the exception of Christ’s own (e.g., the cleansing of the Temple), are either wicked or miscarry<sup>34</sup>. Several of the Fathers say that such zeal contradicts the patience demanded by the Gospel: ‘Judaical fervour’ is far from the ‘meekness of the Gospel.’<sup>35</sup> In any case, righteous zeal flowed from direct inspiration by God, whereas Christians now are governed by the written word, not by ‘enthusiasms and seducing spirits.’<sup>36</sup> This last assertion, which seems to suggest that Christianity is more tied to written, fixed commands than was Judaism, is perhaps rather odd; however, it is entirely consistent with Hammond’s theological method and with his profound distrust of ‘enthusiasm.’

Finally in this tract, Hammond emphasizes Christ’s reproof of the apostles when they seek to punish the faithless, as in Luke ix: 54 and Matthew xxvi: 51. If not even the apostles may act without the magistrate to defend the very person of Christ, then there can be no right for Christians to defend the faith of Christ in such a way. Hammond’s conclusion, therefore, is that the liberty of zeal ended with Christ, and that now the magistrate alone may punish malefactors, whether the evil they do is against man or God<sup>37</sup>.

In addition to these three tracts on Biblical aspects of the resistance question, a fourth, Of taking up the Cross, requires attention here. This tract, as its title suggests, is more contemplative and less polemical than the others. In it Hammond develops a major theme of his later writings: that suffering is an integral and distinguishing part of Christian practice and that non-resistance is a large part of such Christian suffering. Hammond’s later works refer frequently to this ‘doctrine of the Cross.’<sup>38</sup> For Hammond the ‘doctrine of the Cross’ is not directly related to the atonement or to
Christ’s priesthood, but rather refers to his approach to political and practical affairs. Hammond will use this doctrine to encourage and exhort Anglican churchmen during the following years of persecution. In this early tract the doctrine is part of Hammond’s argument for passive obedience. If such obedience leads to suffering, Hammond says, then that suffering is part of the Christian’s cross, to be borne patiently and meekly. Neither nature nor the Old Testament makes suffering a duty. But the New Testament teaches that suffering is required to conform the Christian to Christ’s image and to make him a son of God: “The righteous shall be punish’d in the earth.” Conversely, those who do not suffer are not sons but bastards. It follows, Hammond says, that, as Saint Augustine observed, until the Holy Ghost came ‘no man was a Martyr for Christ; but after they came in shoes...’ Patient acceptance of the crosses of temporal existence as gifts of ‘Gospel-Providence’ will mortify the remains of sin, give occasion for exercising virtues such as humility and meekness, and serve as a purgatory on earth, so that with all arrears paid here only heaven will remain ahead for the Christian.”

Hammond poses a series of questions to his readers that assumes acceptance of belief in the necessity of suffering: do they grumble or seek to shift their burden onto others? do they plot and project to upset kingdoms or even to shed blood so as to rid themselves of their crosses? do they expect future, secular rewards for present sufferings? These questions, put to all readers indifferently, will purify and clarify motives if they are faced squarely by

...every man in this broken State, and Church, most sadly militant, of what persuasions soever he be...<42>

Rebellion is, among other things, an attempt to rid oneself of one’s own proper cross, so the ‘doctrine of the Cross’ has a direct political significance. Hammond appears to accept the misfortunes that the civil wars brought his own party in the light of this doctrine. In later writings Hammond will interpret the misfortunes of the Church and the royalist party as divine punishment for religious indifference, failure to pray for the Church and clergy, and for even more general moral failings.<43> In the early tract Of taking up the Cross he anticipates this later interpretation by referring to the political reversals of the early 1640s:

...the doctrine of the Cross being not so well laid to heart by those who three years since conceived themselves the principal Scholars in that School...God is now pleased to call another sort of men into that form, to try whether they will prove better proficients than their Predecessors have done. ...<44>

Such thoughts really belong to Hammond’s ascetics more than to his politics or even to his moral theology. But in any case, these early tracts clearly show that for Hammond the ‘doctrine of the Cross’ is closely tied to politics and that politics, and in particular obedience and patience under affliction, say much in turn about one’s spiritual state.
27. KROMA, p. 314.
32. Cf. Andrewes's sermon on 1 Chronicles xvi.22 ('Touch not Mine anointed') in The Works of Lancelot Andrewes (New York: AMS Press, 1967 [1854]), volume IV: 'The persons concerning whom, whom He styleth His "anointed," will fall out to prove the princes of the earth.' (Page 49) The prince is anointed by God, not by the pope (pp. 51f.), nor by the people (a 'claim...of late begun to be buzzed of, as if they were christi populi' [p. 52]). In particular Andrewes rejects the claim that 'If after he is "anointed" he grow detecive...prove a tyrant, fall to favour heretics, his anointing may be wiped off, or scraped off, and then you may write a book De Jurea abdications, make a holy league, touch him, or blow him up as ye list. This hath cost Christendom dear...' (Page 57) 'The exalted and inviolate character of monarchy is taught by Andrewes particularly in the sermons on the Gowries' plot, in the miscellaneous sermons, and in the Lenten sermons before Elizabeth and James: see Trevor A. Owen, Lancelot Andrewes (Boston: Twayne, 1981), p. 128. Andrewes in this matter writes primarily against Roman Catholics, with an occasional glance towards radical Protestants. This emphasis is reversed in Hammond. Hammond's annotation d. on Psalm cv.15 reads: '...as there were three offices to which union was used, the Regal, the Sacerdotal, the Prophetical; so each of these may not unfily be styled...my [i.e. God's] anointed; but especially the King is thus styled.' (Works IV, p. 300)
33. Zealots, pp. 316ff.
34. Ibid, p. 319.
37. Ibid, p. 320.
38. On the 'doctrine of the Cross' or 'taking up the Cross' in Hammond's other works, see, e.g., Practical Catechism, pp. 70-8 and 102; Fund., p. 478; and Sermon III, pp. 56 and 65f. In Sermon VI, p. 119, Hammond directly contrasts rebellion with bearing the cross.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid, pp. 321f.
42. Ibid, p. 324.
43. In the P.C. Hammond describes civil war as God's greatest punishment upon a wicked nation (p. 95). Paraenesis, Chapter II, says that the Church of England's afflictions were brought on by indevotion in offering the Liturgy, by failure to renounce what the Liturgy renounces for infants in their baptism, by careless communions, by the profaning of marriage, and by failure to pray sufficiently for good clergy. The significance of suffering is a major theme in Hammond's sermons and in the Paraenesis. For a useful consideration of the cause and significance of suffering in Hammond's theology see J. Sears McGee, The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620-1670 (New Haven and London: Yale, 1976), pp. 29f.
44. Cross, p. 323.

A Royal Passion:
The Turbulent Marriage of Charles I and Henrietta Maria

by Katie Whitaker

reviewed by The Rev’d Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC

Whitaker, Katie, A Royal Passion: The Turbulent Marriage of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 363 pp., illustrated, b/w and color £20.00

When I first saw reference to this volume, I cannot say that I was eager either to purchase or to read it. I fully expected the usual clichês to be trotted out: the stubborn, arrogant ideologue King Charles, riding roughshod over his people, and the screaming virago Henrietta Maria, thirsting to dominate her husband, the English people, and the godly Protestant religion! We’ve all read that kind of book, I suspect, and it can hold few delights for members of the S.K.C.M. What I discovered instead when the book came from England, and I finally had time to read it with a cold drink and my feet up in Newport this summer, was something entirely different.
As is perhaps irresistible, the author begins with 30 January 1649. She interweaves very skillfully the days of various people involved, as well as Henrietta Maria’s reaction subsequently when news finally reached her and was confirmed. She paints a vivid picture of the day and what happened, neither sugar coating anything nor making paper villains for us to hiss at. There was more than enough blame to go around on that day, and the consequences were tragic for all the principals: not just the King, but his Queen, the Prince of Wales (to become Charles II), and all the witnesses of varying hues of opinion and belief. It is quite true to say that England and Scotland were never the same thereafter, and certainly neither was the monarchy. The struggle which had as its punctuation point the beheading was not ended with a full stop, but rather with a semi-colon. The Civil War was indeed over, but the agony of the Commonwealth was just beginning, and it remained to achieve the Restoration, and subsequently the drama of the “Glorious Revolution” and its final alteration of the (now) British Monarchy. It is no exaggeration to say, as the author does, that the monarchy, the Stuart dynasty, the Church of England, the Church in Scotland, those directly involved, and indeed everyone in the British Isles, were never the same after that fateful day. In many ways, there is English history before the 30th of January 1649, and English history after. The Magna Carta is not even so influential or directly a break, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the Civil War and its outcome, taken together with the Glorious Revolution, form the great “fleshing out” of the process begun at Runnymede.

Perhaps the most enjoyable and beguiling part of the book is the description of the youths of Charles and Henrietta Maria. Charles, of course, was neither fated to become King or expected to. It was his elder brother, the Prince of Wales, who was to succeed James I, their father, as Henry IX. When Henry died, suddenly James I had to pay attention to Charles in a way he never had before. Eventually it became clear both that James’s life was coming to its end, and that a wife must be found for Charles, now Prince of Wales, following his brother’s premature death. A perhaps little known incident is recounted, telling the tale of Charles’s lovelorn “cavalier mission” to Spain to beg for the hand in marriage of a Spanish infanta, who was refusing to consider him because he was not a Roman Catholic. He rode with the Duke of Buckingham, his father’s “favourite”, all the way to Spain seeking the infanta’s hand. The mission was unsuccessful but it is clear that both men, consciously echoing the Middle Ages and the knights striving for their damsels, embarked on this mission for the fun and excitement of it all. Once that chapter was closed, intriguing began to marry Charles off either to a Protestant German princess (desired by Parliament) or to the daughter of Henri IV, King of France and Navarre, and his consort, Marie de Medici. Religion was again a difficulty, as Henri IV had forsworn Protestantism to ensure he and his dynasty (the Bourbons) would succeed their distant relations, the Valois, who had died out. Paris vaut bien une messe, Henri had said, and presumably it was. Eventually the arrangements were agreed, and the ministers of King James I and King Louis XIII began the customary negotiations, only this time with reference to the Barberini Pope Urban VIII, as of course there were heavy religious implications for the marriage. England and Scotland’s Catholics took heart, hoping that the King, married to a Catholic, would champion the cause of their liberation and end the penal laws. They hoped even more that the children of Charles and Henrietta Maria would be themselves Catholics. Negotiations floundered, and looked as though they might even peter out, but in 1625, King James I suddenly died, and it was now up to Charles to negotiate whatever marriage treaty suited him. He did exactly that, and very shortly, Henrietta Maria, “Madame de France” (eldest daughter of the French king – like the title Princess Royal), took leave of her mother, Marie de Medici, and took ship for England.

37
One of the fascinating interludes of this book is the narration of their early marriage, which was turbulent in the extreme. Henrietta Maria was not particularly interested in fitting in to the English Court or English society at all. She was not what our age would call “celebrating of diversity”. She was appalled at the Anglican ascendancy, even more appalled by Puritans and Quakers, and failed to understand in any sense the relationship between the English King and his Parliament. This misunderstanding (relying on her grounding in French absolutism) was of course to bear unfortunate fruit in the 1640s. The marriage was on very thin ice for years, with wrangles about Henrietta’s Catholic and French ladies in waiting, her many chaplains saying many masses in Latin and hearing many confessions in French, and her throwing open of her chapels to English Catholics to hear mass which was, after all, technically illegal. All of this changed in a moment in 1628, with the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham, who had become a kind of Prime Minister to Charles. Henrietta wisely set aside her antipathy to the Duke and her wounded feelings over the poor treatment she believed she had received from him and all the English court, and concentrated on comforting and re-assuring her husband, who felt he had lost both his best friend and his best minister. In this shared experience, love blossomed, and shortly thereafter everyone began to comment on the new and clearly close relationship between King and Queen.

Being accustomed, as we are, to accounts of the Civil War which dwell on Cromwell, the New Model Army, the Rump Parliament, the battle of Naseby, the Royal Oak, and so on, it is a novel experience to follow the sad history of the Civil War through the eyes and the relationship of the King and Queen. It is often suggested that Henrietta Maria was a raging virago, who hated the English people, the Protestant religion, and their civil liberties, and desired to set up a French-style Catholic Absolute Monarchy in England. This is not to say that she might not have wished such a thing to happen! But her first focus was on the King and his throne, and its stability, passing on to Charles, Prince of Wales, their son. She was also a realist, and having lived some many years in England (twenty years by the middle of the Civil War) she now knew a great deal more about the English character, its government, and the English people. (Scotland remained a closed book to her and to the King, even as it remains to many of us not Scots!) It was decided that for safety, and to plead the King’s cause, Henrietta would go to France. From Paris, she wrote countless letters to the King, urging him on to various courses of action, but always with loving support. The King’s letters back to her are tender and loving, and non-committal as to his intentions. Most surprising is Henrietta’s complete support for a plan for Charles to agree to the demands for Scots Presbyterianism, to get them to support his cause with a Scots army, destroy the English under Cromwell, and then turn on the Scots with the English Army (by now under his control in theory), and renge on the agreement which, he would have claimed, he had made with a mental reservation. (Just the kind of plan the English believed her Jesuit confessor was urging on her!) Sometimes, we read the biographies of saints and we are rather disappointed with their relations with other people: their colleagues, disciples, spouses, children. Saint Jerome was famously irascible, and Saint Charles Borromee whilst clearly a saintly bishop, appears to have been rather a trial to work for. Of Saint Rose of Lima, Donald Attwater says in his Penguin Dictionary of Saints, “Such saints pose delicate problems of religion and psychiatry.” It is a relief to find that the marriage of Charles and Henrietta, though it began as a rather stormy business, blossomed quickly into real and lasting love, which carried them both through all the dreadful scenes of their lives. He carried a miniature of her to the scaffold and wore it over his heart. She, for her part, lived on twenty years as a bereaved widow, living to see her son restored to his rightful heritage as Charles II in 1660. Her relationships with her sons were always rather difficult, both because of her complete commitment to the Roman Church and her lack of
understanding as to why they would not immediately accept her religion. Her youngest son, Henry, Duke of Gloucester (1640-1660) had promised to become a Catholic, but in the end, did not follow through, which led to their complete estrangement. Charles II often laughingly suggested to her that he would one day become a Catholic, if perhaps not until his death bed. This frequent joke actually turned out to be true, of course. Only her second son, James II, became a Catholic as he promised her, but let her down terribly (in her eyes) by marrying Anne Hyde, a commoner, and the daughter of one of his father and brother’s chief advisers, the Earl of Clarendon. Henrietta Maria, the haughty Medici, daughter of Henri IV and Marie of that perfidious family, sister of Louis XIII, aunt of Louis XIV, descendant of Saint Louis IX, was not prepared to welcome a young English common girl called simply Anne Hyde, as her daughter-in-law.

The sad end to Henrietta Maria’s story is as much touching as it is deplorable. She lived on in near penury at the Court in France until her death in 1669. For a time after the Restoration, she had returned to London, and glittered as Queen Mother, but she had continually caused controversy with various of her son’s Ministers and her clear advocacy not only for the Roman Church, but also for absolute monarchy, won her few friends. Eventually, it became plain to all concerned that it would be best for her to return to France, which she did in 1665. One of her last great projects was the marriage of her youngest daughter, Henrietta, to the Duke d’Orleans, the brother of Louis XIV, the infamous “Monsieur”. Though the Duke quite openly preferred the company, both socially and sexually, of other men, the marriage was a success and through their children, Henrietta Maria and Charles I became ancestors of most of the monarchs of Europe, including King Juan Carlos of Spain, the Duke of Parma, and the reigning Grand Duke of Luxembourg (and all the French, Spanish and Italian Bourbons after Louis XV), the Grand Duke of Liechtenstein, the pretender to the throne of Bavaria, and most of the present-day Habsburg dynasty, and all the Catholic Stuart pretenders. Oddly therefore, the King of Spain is a direct descendant of Charles I and Henrietta Maria whilst Elizabeth II is descended not from Charles I but from James I his father, through his daughter Elizabeth, the Winter Queen.

The book is beautifully written and quite engaging. Though not a specialist in this period, I detected no errors or stretches in fact, and it was entirely a pleasure to read. It was illuminating to learn more of Henrietta’s encouragement of the arts, every bit as strong as her husband’s. She was a patron of Orazio Gentileschi and his daughter Artemisia Gentileschi, who produced not only paintings but whole schemes of decoration, both at Somerset House and at the Queen’s House in Greenwich, and she also patronised Guido Reni, whose fame then was very widespread, though today he would be regarded by most as a secondary artist of the period. In the end, perhaps the most pleasing thing about this book is the very strong picture it gives us of the very important, influential and loving relationship between the Royal Martyr and his uncrowned consort, Henrietta Maria, and encourages us in thinking that this relationship and their children made their sufferings possible and even endurable.

[The Rev’d Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC, recently elected to the Order of Laud, is rector of the Church of the Resurrection on the Upper East Side of Manhattan. He had previously been the rector of S. Clement’s, Philadelphia. He is a member of Societas Sanctis Crucis and Superior-General of the Guild of All Souls in America.]
Sophia of Hanover: From Winter Princess to Heiress of Great Britain, 1630-1714
by J. N. Duggan
reviewed by Suzanne G. Bowles, Ph.D.


Sophia of Hanover, if she is known at all, is a genealogical footnote in the history of the British royal family. Had she lived three months longer she would have become Queen, but it was not to be. Although she never became the British monarch she nonetheless held a key position in the family tree as the link between the Stuarts and the Hanoverians. She is all but unknown today. However, this excellent book tries to remedy that. The product of fifteen years of research and translations by the author, this biography brings to life the woman who almost became Queen and whose descendants sit on the throne to this day. The book is based on Sophia’s own memoirs, written in 1680, and her vast correspondence covering a fifty-six year period.

Sophia was born in 1630, the twelfth of thirteen children of Frederick V of the Palatinate and Elizabeth, daughter of James VI & I. Since their parents were known as the Winter King and Queen, the children were known as the Winter Princes and Princesses. Two of Sophia’s brothers were Rupert and Maurice who fought for their uncle, Charles I, in the Civil War. Brought up largely at The Hague, Netherlands, Sophia was briefly, but not very seriously, courted by her cousin Charles II. His manner of courtship left something to be desired, as he told her that “she was more beautiful than his current mistress.” Sophia, always a shrewd judge of character even at a young age, remarked in her memoirs that “I had enough judgment to know that the marriages of great princes are not made in such a fashion.” (p. 42) In 1658 she married Ernst August who under a very complicated arrangement was, along with his three brothers, a Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg. The marriage was a happy one, even though Ernst August later took mistresses, a fact of life which, though it distressed Sophia, she accepted. Sophia’s philosophy of marriage was expressed in one sentence where she reflected on her wedding day. “I was delighted to find that he was lovable because I was determined to love him.” (p. 61) Sophia and Ernst August had seven children. Eventually succeeding to rule of the Duchy of Hanover, Ernst August was determined to raise its status to that of Electorate of the Holy Roman Empire and his own status to Elector. This he finally achieved in 1692 at a considerable cost in “bribes and entertainments”. (p. 139)

Thus Sophia became the Electress of Hanover.

As her correspondence and memoirs show, Sophia was highly intelligent, well travelled, witty, down to earth, and a shrewd judge of character. She also possessed what we would call today “street smarts” as she maneuvered for herself and her family in the hot-house world of European royalty. Related to most of them by blood or marriage, and a frequent visitor to royal courts all over the continent, she penned vivid word-portraits of her royal contemporaries which are
not only entertaining but show astute judgment as to who was or was not an effective player of the royal game.

Although most interested in what was going on in continental courts, Sophia kept an eye on events in England and was quick to see how they might affect her. After her cousin James II was overthrown in the Glorious Revolution she wasted little time in writing a congratulatory note to William of Orange, now William III (joint monarch with his wife Mary II, elder daughter of James II), telling him “Y[our] M[ajesty] can count me amongst the most zealous of his supporters who will be all her life.” (p. 134) Even at this early date (1689) both she and William knew there was a possibility that she might be a successor to the English Crown. “I have received a letter,” she wrote to her close friend, the philosopher Gottfried Leibniz, “from the new King of England, who informs me that I have good reason to interest myself in the welfare of England, since apparently one of my sons will succeed to it.” (p. 135)

As it seemed increasingly unlikely that William and Mary would ever have any children, more attention naturally fell on the immediate heir, Princess Anne, Mary’s younger sister. Married to Prince George of Denmark, Anne had no trouble getting pregnant (the number of her pregnancies is usually given at seventeen, though some historians go as high as twenty-one!), but she did have trouble producing a live healthy child. This put Sophia, as the nearest Protestant relative, next in line. The purpose of all the worry, of course, was to prevent the Roman Catholic line of James II from making a comeback. James’s son from his second marriage to Mary of Modena, James Francis Edward, was still a baby, but as long as he was alive he remained a threat to the Protestant Settlement of the Glorious Revolution. However, in 1689 Anne gave birth to a son William (given the title Duke of Gloucester) who seemed healthy. The sense of crisis abated and the prospect of Sophia succeeding to the throne faded. All the hopes of a Protestant Stuart dynasty rested on this one child. (Anne’s subsequent pregnancies failed to produce a live child.)

The situation dramatically changed with the sudden death of Prince William in 1700 at the age of eleven. (He was, however, immortalized by the naming of Williamsburg, Virginia, and its main street, Duke of Gloucester Street, after him.) Parliament wasted little time in passing the Act of Settlement (12 &13 Wm. III, cap. 2) which “for default of such issue” by Princess Anne, or King William (by a hypothetical second marriage), the throne would go to “the most excellent Princess Sophia, electress and dowager duchess of Hanover” and “the heirs of her body being Protestant.” [for full text of the Act of Settlement see www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46986] Sophia was seventy-three at the time and Anne, who succeeded her brother-in-law William in 1702, was thirty-five years younger so it seemed unlikely that Sophia would ever become Queen. She realized this and was more concerned to smooth the way for her eldest son George Louis, but occasionally she showed a glimmer of ambition and thought she might outlive Anne since Anne was rumored to be in poor health while Sophia was in excellent health “because I guard my tranquility.” (p. 183)

Queen Anne was cool, though minimally polite, to her Hanoverian successors. There were occasional attempts to bring Sophia or her son to England, but Anne would have none of it fearing the establishment of a rival court. (Anne’s fears were well-founded given the later history of Hanoverian sons setting up rival courts to their fathers.)

Sophia died at the age of eighty-three never having succeeded to the English throne. But she came closer than one might have expected. Only sixty-five days later Queen Anne died. Sophia’s eldest son George Louis (George I), his eldest son George Augustus (George II), and his eldest son Frederick Louis (Prince of Wales, father of George III) came to England and their descendant sits on the throne today.
Of course we will never know what kind of monarch Sophia would have made. She was elderly but she had her full faculties right to the end. And unlike her son she spoke fluent English -- without a foreign accent, as she liked to say, because she had an English mother.

This book would not pass scholarly muster because of its lack of source citation. There are footnotes but they are solely explanatory. Nonetheless the text itself usually identifies the source, whether Sophia’s memoirs or other correspondence. There are useful genealogical charts as well as an appendix containing several of Sophia’s letters, some in French, some in German, and some in English. (Sophia was fluent in five languages.)

This is a thoroughly-researched, well-written narrative about an important but neglected figure. Sophia is an interesting character in her own right and well worth reading about. This reviewer recommends the book and thinks our members will enjoy it.

**A NOTE ON THE SALIC LAW**

The Salic Law (or rather one clause from a long list) prohibits women or their descendants from succeeding to a throne. The law got its name from the Salian Franks and dates back to the early VI Century. A number of European monarchies adhered to this. The reasons England did not are somewhat murky but probably date back to 1120 when Henry I’s only son died and he wanted to secure the succession for his daughter Matilda. This triggered a long struggle with her cousin Stephen, both claiming the throne and variously getting and losing important backers. In the end, though, Matilda’s son, Henry II, was recognized by both parties as the rightful heir.

When Sophia’s son George Louis succeeded to the English throne as George I he retained his title as Elector (later King) of Hanover. This title descended to his heirs George II, George III, George IV, and William IV. Hanover, however, adhered to Salic law. Thus when Victoria succeeded her uncle William IV in 1837 she was not eligible to succeed to the Hanoverian title. That went to her uncle Ernest, Duke of Cumberland, the eldest surviving son of George III.

[SUZANNE G. 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 Germanic influence on American politics, Germaine de Staël's influence on American politics, and the role of women in the French Revolution. She is a member of the American Historical Association, the Society of American Historians, and the American Society for the History of the Early republic. She has served on the editorial board of the Journal of the History of Ideas and is on the advisory board of the Journal of the History of Ideas. She lives with her husband and two children in New York City.]
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**2012 Anniversaries of our Members’ Ordinations and Consecrations**

Thou art a priest forever, after the Order of Melchisedek. *Ecce sacerdos magnus!*

**Congratulations!**

60th
The Rev’d Vern Edward Jones, OL, Ordained 17 Dec. 1952

55th
The Rev’d Henry George Turnbull, Ordained 1 March 1957

50th
The Ven. Charles Francis Caldwell, Ph.D., Ordained 6 Jan. 1962
The Rev’d Dr. Richard Cornish Martin, SSC, OL, Ordained 13 Jan. 1962
Sophia Dorothea of Celle (Zell), Duchess of Ahlden, “Uncrowned Queen” of Great Britain; the Act of Settlement and the Hanoverian Succession

**Sophie Dorothea, a Biography**

by Ruth Jordan

commentary by John A. E. Windsor

Sophia Dorothea of Celle (Zell) was the wife of the future King George I of Great Britain. At the time of their marriage in 1682 he was George Louis, the eldest child of Ernst August, Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg and first Elector of Hanover. Sophia Dorothea and George Louis were first cousins.

George Louis’s mother was Sophia, Electress of Hanover, who was fifth and youngest daughter of Frederick V, Elector of Palatine, and at one time King of Bohemia. Frederick V’s wife was Princess Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, styled the “Winter Queen” and eldest daughter of King James I of England.

Sophia Dorothea’s mother was Eleonore d’Esquier d’Olbreuse (1639-1722), of a French Huguenot family of untitled nobility. George William (1624-1705), Sophia Dorothea’s father, was son of George, Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg, who was also the father of Ernst August (1624-98), Elector of Hanover. Thus George Louis and Sophia Dorothea, George William’s daughter, were first cousins.

Sophia, Electress of Hanover, George Louis’s mother, was a granddaughter of James I of England. The marriage between George Louis, the future King George I of Great Britain, and Sophia Dorothea was solemnized 22 November 1682. Sophia Dorothea was sixteen years of age; George Louis was twenty-two. In December 1683 Sophia Dorothea gave birth to the future King George II and in 1687 to a daughter named after herself, Sophia Dorothea (1687-1757). This princess, and later Queen of Prussia, the only daughter of Sophia Dorothea of Celle and George Louis wed a first cousin Frederick Wilhelm of Brandenburg, Crown Prince of Prussia and later King of Prussia.

A chief element of interest about Sophia Dorothea of Celle is that in 1689, she fell into a rapturous fixation, an infatuation, with a friend of her brother-in-law, Carl Philipp. This highly placed friend was Count Philipp Christoph von Königsmarck, an officer in Hanoverian service. George Louis the future King George I of Great Britain, while not engaged on military campaign, his principal interest, had also found another interest—of amorous intent—in the person of Ehrengard Melusine von der
Schulenburg, later Duchess of Kendal. It was she who in time bore George Louis three daughters never acknowledged as such.

On the night of 11 July 1694 Count von Königsmarck was murdered by a group of young zealot officers anxious to safeguard the reputation of the Electoral House. The body of the Count was dropped into the portion of the River Leine beside the Electoral Palace. An Italian Count Montalban alone was held responsible for the murder.

Sophia Dorothea was ordered into the confinement of her apartments. Incriminating evidence was discovered. The brothers, the Elector Ernst August and George William the Duke of Celle agreed a divorce to be arranged on the grounds of Sophia Dorothea’s refusal to cohabit with George Louis. Lutheran church officials declared the marriage dissolved 28 December 1694.

Sophia Dorothea was removed to a castle in Ahlden. The terms of the divorce provided that she, as the guilty party, not be allowed to remarry and to be denied access to her children. She remained a prisoner at Ahlden for the rest of her life. Her mother interceded with Queen Anne for her release. Sophia Dorothea of Celle, the Duchess of Ahlden, died at the age of sixty and was buried at Celle.

Queen Anne’s only surviving son, Prince William of Gloucester, had died of measles in July 1700. He was eleven years of age. His mother, Queen Anne, was the last of the reigning Stuart monarchs. She and Mary II were daughters of King James II, styled ‘the Catholic’, whose ill-fated reign 1685–88 led to naval stalemate with the Dutch, challenge from William’s army, rebellion in his own army, national bankruptcy, and a refractory disaffection of the country for the King. A large part of it was the rupture over the religious question; the King was Roman Catholic and against Parliament had determined to overthrow the Church of England. The nation did not hold itself in allegiance to papal authority or to the helm of Continental political gatherance. The result was a half century of a submergent and seething rebellion in the Scottish north in the last cause of the Stuarts, long-supported from abroad by the French kings and most adamantly by Louis XIV until the final débâcle, the rising of the clans in 1745.

William III (1650–1702) ruled jointly with Mary II until her death on 28 December 1694, after which he ruled in his own right. He was King of England and Scotland. In Scotland he was designated William II of Scotland. William maintained his position as stadholder of Holland, Prince of Orange, and Count of Nassau-Dillenberg. On 17 June 1701 the fifth parliament of William passed the Act of Settlement whereby succession to the crown was settled, after Princess (later Queen) Anne, on Sophia (1630–1714), Electress of Hanover, and on the heirs of her body—they being C of E.

The Act of Settlement excluded the succession of the Catholic Stuarts—specifically at the time, Queen Anne’s own brother, styled the ‘Old Pretender’, who was proclaimed King of Great Britain in France as James III of England and James VIII of Scotland on 14 September 1701. Mary II, Anne, and James III, the ‘Old Pretender’, were the daughters and son of James II “The Catholic”. Mary and Anne had been brought up in the C of E, while James III and his son Prince Charles, the ‘Young Pretender’ (1720–88) were Roman Catholic and represented the claims of the RC Church on the right and property of Great Britain.

Sophia, Electress of Hanover, was the nearest potential heir under the stipulations of the Act of Settlement. The Act excluded all the more senior descendants of the King-Martyr, Charles I, and of his father, James I; these senior descendants being Roman Catholic in allegiance and practice. James II had a total of twenty legitimate children and at least seven illegitimate, by two mistresses. The Electress Sophia did not live to become Queen of Great Britain. She died shortly before Queen Anne in 1714. Thus Anne was succeeded by Sophia’s son George Louis, who ruled Great Britain and Ireland as King George I from 1714 and was Duke and Elector of Hanover from 1698.
On 1 May 1707 the titles of the sovereign, the reigning monarch, were transformed, that is translated from Queen of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland to Queen of Great Britain, Ireland, and France. When George Louis began his rule as George I, he received the titles King of Great Britain and Ireland, which were added to his previous ones.

Ruth Jordan’s *Sophie Dorothea, a Biography*, provides ample reference that King George I had other mistresses throughout his life besides the Duchess of Kendal. The most prominent of these was Sophia Charlotte Kielmansegg, wife of Baron John Adolph Kielmansegg, the Elector of Hanover’s Master of Horse. Sophia Charlotte’s mother was the Countess Platon, said to have been involved in and taken part in the murder of Count von Königsmarck, Sophia Dorothea of Celle’s *amour*.

Sophia Dorothea of Celle, the Duchess of Ahlden, was sympathetically known as “the Uncrowned Queen of Great Britain”. Prophets and visionaries were in abundance in England and Germany: There were rumors of plots, poisonings, revenge, retribution, and reconciliation—something of the popular repertory of scandal. It was thought not fitting in the civil parlance for the mother of the King of Great Britain to be in house exile in Celle and under a regimen of restraint and vigilance.

In her last days, Sophia Dorothea of Celle was said to have felt betrayed, deserted, and forgotten. She expired on 13 November 1726 in her sixty-first year.

Ruth Jordan was a staff writer for the BBC and was well known as a journalist and broadcaster in the nineteen sixties and seventies. Her book, which is out of print, is not readily accessible. J. H. Plumb barely covered the topic in *The First Four Georges* (1956).

Interest in Sophia Dorothea of Celle, Duchess of Ahlen, was sufficient a half century ago to have caused some psychological objection; it was thought to be of an antiquarian nature to ask, but only slightly. In another context the reaction simply would have been guarded silence. There was a cautionary sensitivity generally toward the German cousinate and the Catholic question, of course, was never raised. The younger personages of the *entre guerre* generation did not consider such ruminations worthy of being aired at all.

**John Arthur Edward Windsor, Benefactor**, was born in April, 1941, two months before Operation Barbarossa. He was received into the Russian Church by Bishop Seraphim, Eparch of Berlin; his encomium sponsor was the Grand Duchess (Grand Princess) Olga Alexandrovna, the Tsar’s sister. Mr. Windsor was created Count of Constantine by Admiral Jean François Darlan, head of the North African Department of the French state. The death of Admiral Darlan changed the course of the war and the destinies of nations.

[At the Soviet armies swept through Eastern Europe in the closing days of the war, the Count of Constantine, for the sake of expediency and security, was placed under the protection and worship of the Hungarian Supreme, Admiral Miklós Horthy and was then in exile with the same. He was recognized by anti-Soviet parties as Count of Jassy (Jai). He observed the Nürnberg trial process and the outcome and executions which followed, the youngest person so present, all of which was a sobering lesson in the consequences of war—its ravages and the fruits of international justice.

[Over the years, Mr. Windsor has served as a patron of charitable organizations and pious societies alike. Following Crown service in Canada, he has devoted his life to the care and counsel of refugees and exiles, the poor, the disabled, and the disenfranchised in the nations of the former Soviet bloc.]
Jane Boleyn. The True Story of the Famous Lady Rockford
by Julia Rox
reviewed by John Arthur Edward Windsor


The Six Wives of Henry VIII
“You can’t tell the players without a score card.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wives No.</th>
<th>Name (Years)</th>
<th>Wife Size</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Catherine of Aragon (1485-1536)</td>
<td>m. 1509-33, annulled by Abp. Thom. Cromwell; bore Mary I, 1516</td>
<td>acceded 1509; received from Pope the title DEFENSOR FIDEI, 1521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Anne Boleyn (1500-36)</td>
<td>m. 1533-6, condemned to death for adultery, decapitated; bore Eliz. I, 1533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Jane Seymour (1500-37)</td>
<td>m. 1536-7, d. following childbirth (Edward VI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Anne of Cleves (1527-57)</td>
<td>m. Jan.-Jul. 1540 (m. at age 13); outlived Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Catherine Howard (1520-42)</td>
<td>m. Jul. 1540-Feb. '42; charged with treason, decapitated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Catherine Parr (1512-48)</td>
<td>m. 1543; was kind stepmother to all three children; outlived Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legitimate Issue
Edward VI: 1537-53 son r. Jan. 1547-July 1553 (from age 9 to 16)
Mary I: 1516-48 daughter r. 1553-8
Elizabeth I: 1533-603 daughter r. 1558-1603 b. born; m. married; d. died; r. reigned

Other Important Personages who Defied Henry VIII
Thomas Wolsey: 1475-1530 Card. Abp. of York, summoned to London to answer a charge of treason, died en route 30 Nov.
Sir Thomas More: 1478-1535 Lord Chancellor; refused to recognize Royal Supremacy; beheaded 22 June 1535
John Fisher: 1469-1535 Archbishop of York, Cardinal; refused to take Oath of Supremacy, beheaded 22 June 1535
Thomas Cromwell: 1485-1540 Emplaced many of Henry's policies; identified Anne of Cleves; then she lost favor; thus beheaded

The subject of the book under review, Jane Parker Boleyn (1511-42), was Anne Boleyn’s sister-in-law. Her father, Lord Morley, was an adherent of Queen Catherine of Aragon. Jane Parker was married to Queen Anne’s brother, George Viscount Boleyn, Lord Rockford.

Jane Viscountess Boleyn, Lady Rockford, was involved in having Jane Seymour sent away from court in the autumn of 1534 when King Henry’s attention began to turn toward her. Jane Seymour, unlike Anne Boleyn, was not in any way Lutheran in her piety and practice but rather the reverse. In September 1536 Martin Luther himself had called the new Queen, Jane Seymour, an enemy of the Gospel.

Queen Anne (Boleyn) was opposed to the cult of the saints and the ‘worship’ of images, veneration, and pilgrimages. Bishops and clergy holding the views of Queen Anne and the Boleyns, including Hugh Latimer, Thomas Cranmer, John Skip, William Barlow, and Matthew Parker were appointed to sees and parishes across the land.

In January 1536, the pregnant Queen Anne had lost the child, a male. The King’s lack of skill and his inadequacy in terms of virile prowess in the marital act were among comments by Queen Anne to her sister-in-law, Lady Rockford—remarks later quoted against the Queen in her trial. Anne was charged with adultery, incest, and conspiracy to murder the King. Anne undoubtedly experienced an intense sorrow provoked by both love and fear of the King, and by the loss of the child. The King was convinced she would never bear him a male heir.

It was said that Lady Rockford had intended to help the cause of Queen Catherine’s daughter Princess Mary, later Queen Mary I (Tudor; 1516-58, r. 1553-8), who was then known simply as Lady Mary in deference to Princess Elizabeth, the future Queen Elizabeth, not yet three. However Lady
Rockford was more substantively to have been one of a court circle who was said to have introduced Lutheranizing tendencies into Henry’s Catholic court. She was partial to the views of Matthew Parker and the other clerics upheld by Queen Anne (Boleyn).

Julia Fox, author of the subject book, seems to take the side of Lady Rockford to the extent that her words and testimony were not malicious, but unintended, and that they were not intentionally slanderous. There was an atmosphere of intrigue, deceit, innuendo, and betrayal about the entire process—this is what Lady Rockford said—misdirected and emphatically misused by the detractors of Anne. The Boleyns were active in the cause of France and were advocates of the interests of France against those of the Emperor Charles. Besides Queen Anne’s own self-incrimination there were others at court—including intimates of the King, whose correspondence was documented and collected by the prosecutor Thomas Cromwell against the Boleyns. Cromwell is said to have “gleaned” the condemnation of her husband from Lady Rockford—that is the author’s interpretation—in that she did not volunteer the information willingly, but gave it up under interrogation.

The conflict at court had much wider implications for the state than the fate of the parties of the two princesses, Mary and Elizabeth and other divisions ongoing simultaneously at court. There was the question of reformed religion at court and in the nation and much further on in terms of international affairs these were issues between Church and Empire. Pope Clement VI had not wanted the Emperor Charles VI to be able to insist on the calling of a General Church Council, the aim of which by its very nature would have been not only to combat the growth of Lutheranism in the emperor’s German domains but would have had the effect of drawing power away from the centralizing forces and constraints that the Papacy had at its disposal in Rome. A General Church council would have opened to a wider review in terms of spiritual and temporal authority the role and mission of the church and its claim to a share in the transaction of a wide variety of interests over the whole of Christendom.

Lady Rockford survived implication in the trial elements that brought down her husband and had not only led to Queen Anne’s execution but to his as well, that is, to the execution of George Viscount Boleyn, Anne’s brother.

The King had come to believe that he was bewitched by Anne and had told a member of the privy chamber that God was denying him a son, and that he the King was “seduced and forced” into this second marriage by means of “sortileges and charms”, this as stated in the Calendar of State Papers of Spain as reported by the ambassador.

It was the topic of the King’s impotence rather than the charge of incest as alleged against Lord Rockford (George Viscount Boleyn) which had been construed from Lady Rockford’s statements that rang with shocking familiarity in the court. The question of whether there was undue familiarity between brother (Lord Rockford) and sister (Queen Anne) seems not to have been corroborated in the sense that modern evidentiary witness would require. Ultimately however it was Lady Rockford who damned Queen Anne for having an incestuous relationship with Lord Rockford, Anne’s brother and Lady Rockford’s husband.

Following the executions of Lord Rockford and Queen Anne, and through the agency of Cardinal Wolsey, Lady Rockford was able to obtain a position of lady-in-waiting to Katherine Howard who was to become King Henry’s fifth queen. In 1537 the King had performed ardently and successfully, as to have sired a male heir, according to the thinking of the day, by Queen Jane (Seymour). The child was to become King Edward VI. He died of consumption; also, he had suffered from congenital syphilis as did his half-sister Princess Mary, who shortly succeeded him following the nine-day reign
of Jane Grey in July 1553. These chronic ailments are not mentioned with any specificity by Julia Fox. Queen Jane (Seymour), however, died twelve days after giving birth to the future King Edward. The King and the court went into mourning. On his death in 1547, Henry was buried according to his wishes next to Queen Jane at Windsor, for it was she whom he had come to regard as his most beloved spouse, because she had borne him the much desired son and male heir, and for the untimely and tragic manner of her passing. The vault in which King Henry and Queen Jane were interred in 1537 and 1547 was used again nearly one hundred years later.

THE INTERMENT OF KING CHARLES I

After his conviction by the kangaroo court, "The High Court of Justice", on the bogus charge of treason, using the arguments in the 'tyrannicide brief' devised by the prosecution team, King Charles I was beheaded on 30 January 1649 on a scaffold one story up from the pavement, erected at the Northwest corner of the Banqueting House, Whitehall. After his body was embalmed and the outer lead coffin soldered shut, his enemies deliberated for some days about the place King Charles should be interred. Two prime loci were rejected, the Chapel of Henry VII in Westminster Abbey, seen as too prone to attract admirers' attention, and the Cardinal Wolsey tomb-house at Windsor, because it was merely adjacent to S. George's Chapel, not within it. Excavation began at a third locus, the vault of Edward IV, chosen because King Charles was known to have spoken highly of that Monarch. Someone tapping on the chapel floor with his cane detected a hollow space beneath; it seemed to be a vault, and upon opening, revealed the coffins of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour. King Charles's coffin was expeditiously placed in the vault, which was then closed, on 8 February 1649.

Henry's coffin of lead appeared to have been violently or cruelly entered. Of the wooden coffin within, only dust remained, and of his body, only the bones, accompanied by no soft tissue, consistent with lore, which said that during the reign of Mary I, Henry's body had been exhumed and his remains burned thoroughly.

In 1541 Jane Viscountess Rockford, then a dowager, was implicated in the scandal of Queen Katherine (Howard) and her affair with the courtier Culpeper. Lady Rockford had attempted to portray herself as an unaccountable presence or as a witness but an innocent who had been elsewhere when Queen Katherine Howard was in intimacy with Culpeper. Lady Rockford alleged that she had not known what offense was in progress with them. Queen Katherine however said that it was Lady Rockford herself who had arranged the dalliance with Culpeper and set it in motion. There really was no witness testimony in the modern sense with juridical process at that time. Culpeper also said that Lady Rockford had provoked him into a clandestine relationship with the Queen.

Queen Katherine’s former amour, one of several, before she had come to the attention of the King, was Francis Dereham, to whom Katherine was at one time precontracted to marry. This precontract had simply been ignored in her subsequent career. Francis Dereham was brought to trial, he was tortured and convicted of treason, and on 10 December 1541 he was put to death accompanied by disembowelment and castration while he was still alive as demanded by the law. Thomas Culpeper died the same day but was allowed decapitation, it was speculated from the King’s vestigial affection for him, for he ahd been close to the King in former days.

Queen Katherine and Lady Rockford met their deaths on the same morning of 13 February 1542 on Tower Hill on the same block one hour apart at the scaffold to the north side of the White Tower. Queen Anne (Boleyn) had died in the Tower in a similar fashion six years earlier. Queen Katherine had never confessed to adultery as she was charged. Neither had Thomas Culpeper. Culpeper was
put to death for intent to commit adultery. Under the Act of Attainder passed 11 February 1542 Queen Katherine was guilty of treason.

The delegates of both houses of parliament had wanted more detail in evidence by further examination of the Queen. However, such was not the will of the King. Katherine Howard’s death was witnessed by members of the privy council and by the great personages of the land.

To complete the list of Henry’s consorts one cannot but speak of Anne of Cleves. Anne was of the ducal family of Jülich and Berg, a great family of the Continent, wealthy and powerful. Cleves was not a protestant State though it had interests with other German sovereignties that were.

Katherine Parr was Henry’s sixth and last wife. She survived him. The author Julia Fox does not say much about Katherine Parr and does not seem to consider the Parrs an important part of the Boleyn story which in truth they are not. Maud Parr, Lady Laine, Katherine’s mother had been a devoted lady-in-waiting to Queen Catherine of Aragon. An uncle, William, Lord Parr of Horton, was an ardent supporter of the reformed religion. Katherine Parr had not been at court during the rise and fall of Anne Boleyn.

Julia Fox is the wife of the historian John Guy. She is a graduate of the University of London and has taught the history of the Tudors and that of XIX Century British and European history in private and public schools. This biography is replete with information about the Parkers, the Boleyns, the Seymours, and the Howards and is drawn from research in archival materials and basic sources. There is a description in detail of the initiation ritual to the Order of the Bath that says much about the Henrician court and the spirit of the age.

We began in the December, 2010, issue to include commentaries on the reviews in H-Net Review Publications, with whose permission the comments by our Editor are accompanied by extensive quotations from the H-Net review. Specifically, per our agreement H-Net’s Citation and URL of the book under review appear. We supplement these with the bibliographical information with which we usually preface our reviews. The H-Net reviews are chosen by The Rev’d Donald H. Langlois of Chandler AZ, who participates in editorial work on this publication and the Email Communiqué.

**The Limits of Loyalty: Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy**

Laurence Cole and Daniel Unowsky, Editors

commentary by Mark A. Wunola, Ph.D., Editor, SKCM News, with excerpts
of review by Ke-Chin Hsia (University of Chicago) appearing in H-Net Review Publications* as

**Bringing the Dynasty Back In**

*see note above
URL: http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=25294

Your editor asks why so many people unthinkingly accept the knee-jerk, anti-monarchical views of the early to mid-XIX Century, that can’t spoken by U. S. presidents starting with Woodrow Wilson, who disguised his prejudice by avowing ‘concern’ and ‘rights’ for all, and ‘progress’ for all mankind. Yes, that’s what they called *Homo sapiens* in the collective existence of the species back then, as enlightened as they fancied themselves to be. Does the suffix ‘-kind’ denote their possession of do-
gooder mentalities? The editor also asks why he intuitively perceives the duplicity of such Woodronian arguments, Potemkine actions, and perpetrators—those who mouth the distortions, who take actions in the name of justice, self-determination, and fairness for humanity, although the actions are based in prejudice and have monstrous and inhuman consequences. One contemporary observer of post-WWI events, H. L. Mencken, the astute, acerbic ‘sage of Baltimore’ saw it for what it was and exposed it regularly; one notable example was his essay, ‘The Archangel Woodrow’. In another place, Mencken famously wrote, “The urge to save humanity is almost always only a false-face for the urge to rule it.”

Our good fortune is to live during this era of ‘revisionist’ historians, academics who take a fresh look at the tired party line prevalent for many generations. In the case of historians’ views of King Charles I or the Stuart Dynasty, the party line originated with the Whigs, who following Milton’s lead sought to discredit King Charles in every possible way. Their dislike of monarchy and misinterpretation of religious conviction as stubbornness continue to exert profound influence: their views pervade the textbooks used in primary school; they imbue our youth with the myth of Oliver Cromwell as a George Washington and King Charles I as a bloody despot akin to Stalin. The European Historian, Ke-chin Hsia of the University of Chicago, is one of the new school. The beginning of his overview of this collection of articles on the Habsburg Dynasty reads as follows:

After about two decades of new research informed by more nuanced views of nations and nationalism, our understanding of the last decades of the Habsburg Monarchy has undergone significant revisions. Gone is the image of a doomed political entity living on borrowed time without really facing up to the fateful force of nationalities. Not only were the nationalities not as solid, natural, or self-evident as used to be assumed, but we also now know that the Habsburg Monarchy, especially in the Cisleithanian half [the Austrian part, to the West of the River Leitha], was presiding over a rapidly developing (and modernizing) society and economy with dynamic new social and political forces emerging and gaining influence. Along with the state authorities that proved to be capable of adapting to the new constitutional environment, these new historical forces could not be easily subsumed under the old heuristic rubric of dynamic, energized, but oppressed nationalities versus a petrified, outdated, and incompetent state in the dualistic straightjacket.

We have seen similar, fresh reevaluations of the beginnings and antecedents of the English Reformation in Eamon Duffy’s The Stripping of the Altars (1992) and in Kevin Sharpe’s reassessment of a major portion of the Martyr-King’s reign, The Personal Rule of Charles I (also 1992).

As Mencken realized even as it was happening, reflexive prejudice against monarchy deprived Europe of the XX Century’s Charles I, the gentle Habsburg Emperor called the “Prince of Peace”, who is now designated a Beatus, lovingly venerated by the people as is evident from the proliferation of wayside shrines throughout Austria and southern Germany, as I was told by a fellow Society member who toured the area ca. six years ago, before the beatification. Charles’s son Otto recently died at age 98. Comments on his requiem and interment appear in the ‘Miscellany’ at the end of this issue.

The Limits of Loyalty gives evidence of the post-WW I distortions that opened Europe to Nazi domination in the West and Communist subjugation in the East, the latter lingering another forty years until the days of Walęsa, Wojtyła, Reagan, and Thatcher. The book under review presents a fresh, balanced view of the oft-maligned Habsburgs.
This charming little book evokes the wonder of a fairy tale or adventure story, but presents the reader with historically accurate accounts of these intriguing structures.

The ingenuity and daring of those who made use of priest’s holes in the days of the Elizabethan persecution of Roman Catholics is touched on in the opening chapters.

These places of concealment varied from tiny closets to hidden apartments and oratories which were often doubly or trebly concealed behind labyrinthine walls and wainscoting, and situated near chimneys to provide light and air to those concealed within.

Trap doors or booby traps, such as the one from which Amy Robsart fell to her death, did indeed exist—and incidentally, Sir Walter Scott’s Kenilworth is an excellent example of how these hidden places have captured the imagination of writers and artists: the Amy of Scott’s novel perished in a fall from a hidden trap, whereas the real-life Amy Robsart was found dead, under suspicious circumstances, at the foot of a flight of stairs.

Secret panels and hidden rooms also served the Cavaliers in the time of Charles I.

The author recounts the escape of Captain Arthur Jones, who, pursued by Cromwell’s soldiers, concealed himself in the hidden chamber of his home, Chastleton. The Roundheads entered the house and searched it thoroughly. Finding nothing, however, they were suspicious and did not leave, spending the night in the bedchamber from which access to the secret room was gained. They were thwarted, however, by the brave and resourceful wife of Captain Jones, who drugged their wine and released her husband from the chamber.

Imagine the delight of discovering a long-forgotten or entirely unknown secret room in the course of renovating an ancient family home. To walk into a secret chamber which had been undisturbed for centuries would be an immediate link to the past, almost like time travel. Fea describes such an event:

A remarkable discovery was made early in the last century [i.e., the XIX] at the Elizabethan Manor house of Bourton-on-the-Water, Gloucestershire, only a portion of which remains incorporated in a modern structure. Upon removing some of the wallpaper of a passage on the second floor, the entrance to a room hitherto unknown was laid bare. It was a small apartment about eight feet square, and presented the appearance as if some occupant had just quitted it. A chair and a table within, each bore evidence of the last inmate. Over the back of the former hung a priest’s black cassock, carelessly flung there a century or more ago, while on the table stood an antique tea-pot, cup, and silver spoon, the very tea leaves crumbled to dust with age.

Chastleton itself is described as a quaint and delightful Jacobean hall which contains many treasures:

Among its most valued relics is a Bible given by Charles I when on the scaffold to Bishop Juxon, who lived at Little Compton manor house, near Chastleton. This Bible was always used by the Bishop at the Divine services, which at one time were held in the great hall of the latter house. Other relics of the martyr-
king used to be at Little Compton—viz., some beams of the Whitehall scaffold, whose exact position has occasioned so much controversy. The velvet armchair and footstool used by the King during his memorable trial were also preserved here, but of late years have found a home at Moreton-in-the-Marsh, some six miles away.

Would it not be extraordinary, while renovating one’s home, to take an unexpected journey back in time? One thinks of castles, rambling mansions in the country (or what used to be the country), or the ‘stately homes’ administered by the National Trust as possibilities for containing a concealed room or suite, but not a house in the suburbs. Finding a room unnoticed by the home inspector would give new meaning to the saying. “A man’s home is his castle.”

Originally published in 1901, this Dodo Press paperback edition is attractive and affordable.

[Benactress and Order of Laud member Sarah Gilmer Payne of Martin GA has been a contributor to these pages for twenty-five years. Chief among her interests are the Royal Martyr, his life and times, and diverse aspects of his reign, as well as her many animals, feline, canine, and equine. Sarah must have read, and for that matter, must own, nearly every book about King Charles. She is an extraordinary resource, for whom we give thanks, and a much appreciated supporter, extraordinaire.]
Michael Swan's comprehensive article raises a number of the issues that need to be settled as Anglicans move toward full communion with Rome. As a Ukrainian Catholic who is also active in the Anglican devotional Society of King Charles the Martyr, I would like to offer my own perspective.

By coming into a full relationship with Rome, Eastern Rite Christians (or “Orthodox in communion with Rome”) did not leave their particular ecclesial, liturgical or spiritual patrimony behind them. In fact, Eastern Catholics belong to several Particular Churches whose primatial heads (whether a patriarch or a major archbishop, for example) are in union with the Roman Pontiff. The Pope of Rome is both the head of the Particular Latin Catholic Church and the Petrine Minister who, as the Successor of Saint Peter, exercises a universal pastoral role, primarily in maintaining and defending Catholic faith and morals. Eastern and Anglican Catholics do and will accept the Pope's authority in his latter role. The primates of the Particular Churches have the responsibility to look after their own “in-house” matters such as liturgical and immediate ecclesial matters themselves.

There will always be tension between those in our own Particular Church who are for our authentic spiritual patrimony and those are for greater liturgical assimilation to that of the Latin Particular Church. The historic position of Rome itself on this matter has always been clear. Eastern and Anglican Catholics are called to be “themselves” and to grow in daily knowledge about the riches of their own traditions which form an integral part of the riches of Christ and His Church.

Their coming into union with Rome underscores, rather than weakens, their vocation as Anglicans to be true to their particular spiritual and ecclesial patrimony. Their union with Rome brings them back into that Communion centred around the Successor of Peter that the “Ecclesia Anglicana” once cherished very highly (as one example, the number of churches dedicated to Saint Peter in England prior to the XVI Century outnumbered those in any other European country). As an “Orthodox in communion with Rome,” I join in prayer for our Anglican brothers and sisters who are already in union with Rome and for those who are about to enter it. May the intercession of their patron, Saint Charles, King and Martyr, continue to guide and protect them along their path, which is one of many, that leads to Rome!

The editor adds that as a Society we continue to learn of the submission of Anglican members to the RC Church.* The consequence is almost always their resignation from the Society, not in rancor but in what would appear to be disinterest. In light of the statement about the Anglican Patrimony made by John Paul II (quoted in Mr. Robin Davies’s ‘Greeting’ above), I hope for some of these valued members and friends to remain S.K.C.M. members and to be the bearers of that Patrimony as they proceed on their earthly pilgrimage. From what bits we gather, Blessed John Henry Newman and Msgr. Ronald Knox retained their personal veneration of King Charles the Martyr after they became Roman Catholics. In the case of the former, it would not be surprising if records had been expunged (at least, in the editor’s view).

The prominence of Newman and Knox might have led to increased controversy had too much been made of it. This is the position of Anglicans who have gone to the Antiochian Orthodox Church: personal veneration, not public. And we surely would not wish to impugn a co-religionist’s integrity or decision of conscience in choosing another road. Sometimes the decision is a necessary compromise that includes practical considerations of family or location. Almost always it is difficult.

We of the Society should be able to understand this, since we try to model Christian unity as clients of the Martyr-King. Our own Society’s Cause is controversial enough, so we feel that as Society members we should take no positions on controversial issues, although of course we have our own personal positions on them. We choose not to divide the Society in giving honor to Saint Charles, venerating him, and by introducing those contentious issues into the mix, confecting salmagundi rather than zahaglione.

*In addition to corporate submissions as envisioned with the Ordinariate, there are always cases of individual Anglicans converting to Roman Catholicism. These have usually involved termination of Society membership. Why? As a gesture of cutting ties with Anglican organizations. Many converts from Anglicanism to RCism see as a benefit the opportunity to cease the controversialist focus of many traditionalist Anglicans. Many of our co-religionists felt themselves liberated from reading of lawsuits focusing on minutiae of parish and diocesan life, the parties being parishes, dioceses, and ‘815’ and newly able to focus on the Faith once delivered and their own personal quest for “that pardon [we] have always desired”
and ‘the place of light and refreshment’. Some feel the veneration of the Martyr-King is inconsistent with being a faithful RC, probably because Newman’s rôle in the Oxford Movement was seen by us as critical and that struck us as inspired in its scholarly, intellectual approach to controversy. The leadership he exerted was through these factors, and the sense of bereavement and abandonment—the power vacuum that he left behind—these were surely caused by the same factors. After Newman’s departure to Rome, remaining Tractarians were inconsolable. They felt utterly abandoned, without leadership, and hopeless. Not only an intellectual and a controversialist, Newman also had an ability to inspire loyalty, action, and commitment by reaching the soul as well as the mind. By this power—a Divine gift—disciples gathered around him and he made fast friends. How did these happen? It seems that his motto, “Cor ad cor loquitur” (Heart speaks to heart), answers the question.

(We might add that Newman engaged in one controversy with an obsessive intensity. This was the Achilli matter, in which he was accused of libel and which he lost. Newman’s intellectual powers, energy, and time were employed not in reading, study, and writing but in helping to devise arguments against his accuser and in participating in the legal strategizing and development of tactical details to support his side of the case, which in the event would be adjudicated seemingly on the bases of arbitrary considerations and factors unknown to him. He was fined £100, but his legal expenses were £16,000.)

There are also instances of Society members’ conversion from Anglicanism to one of the branches of Orthodoxy, Russian or Antiochian, without feeling the necessity to leave the Society, and of those who are Orthodox—Russian, Antiochian, and Greek—joining the Society. And since the late 1970s Episcopalians have decided as individuals and as parishes to become members of one of the Continuing Churches or another Anglican entity or jurisdiction. I don’t wish to arouse emotions such as anger, jealousy, etc., and have no desire to be controversial. It is hard to avoid angering some people, especially since certain words have taken on particular connotations, not always the same to different groups. Among the Continuing bodies, there are differences on some points but on one thing there is agreement—the Martyr King’s feast-day appears on their Calendars. Please allow for these difficulties and know that we intend to marginalize no one who venerates the Royal Martyr; for him may the veneration be a healthy first step toward collegiality and unity in Christ. The Martyr-King points us to the King of Kings.

Let me say only that the ‘Continuers’ use that name to state the position that they are remaining true to historic Anglican principles and that TEC has diverged from some of those principles. They and many members of Continuing bodies, or of the RC and Orthodox churches, have thought wrongly that (a) we are affiliated with TEC—not true—or that (b) we allow only members of TEC to enroll in S.K.C.M.—also untrue. Repeat—not either of these beliefs is accurate. It is true that the British Society admitted only members of the C of E at one time, but now permits others of the Anglican tradition to join. Here in America, we have never had such policies. In our Articles and Bylaws the requirements are stated explicitly, namely, being:

(i) a Christian
(ii) interested in King Charles I
(iii) supportive of the objectives of the Society
(iv) current in the payment of annual dues

When the Society was founded there was little need to define this point. With minor exceptions, among Anglicans the ‘only game in town’ has been: the C of E in England; The Episcopal Church in the U.S.; and to the North, the Anglican Church of Canada. Now there is a largely inchoate ecumenical spirit to consider, it and other reasons causing some Orthodox, Roman Catholics, and protestants to wish to enroll, and to join in worship, prayer, and fellowship with members of the other churches of the Anglican tradition mentioned but not clearly specified in the previous paragraph. Members of all these groups should be made to feel welcome to enroll. In extending such welcome, we acknowledge the honor and veneration they feel for and give to our Patron Saint, and neither endorse nor reject the subjects of their disagreements as a Society. The term ‘Anglican Communion’ has become an exclusionary criterion. Forty years ago an Anglican was a member of the Anglican Communion, then considered to mean being in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Now some parts are in communion, some not, and some in “Impaired Communion”. Individuals’ affiliations change. Among ecclesiastical bodies, alliances change. Since some within it aren’t in communion with each other, and some have said they and another body are in a state of ‘impaired communion’. The same is true among some of the bodies among the Continuing Churches. (Technically, the Continuum includes both ‘Establishment’ Anglicans and the Continuing Churches so we just say, ‘Anglicans’, or partakers of the ‘Anglican tradition’ or ‘patrimony’. The latter is often used among those who are serious about moving toward the unite-like status that the Ordinariate seems to offer; however, it must be said that none of the terms yet has a strict, agreed meaning.
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We assume that all such bodies have been formed in good faith and seek God’s Glory, yet we know the consequences of human imperfection, Sin. We worry that as in Babel confusion and disorder may make it hard for the Faithful to be faithful, and to show others our Love—our Christian Witness to the World.

**Editorial – Headlines (from p. 10)**

If people see us rejoicing when everyone, even others who sympathize with us, is enraged, they will know we are Christians, ‘Fools for Christ’ Our Lord told us that we would be opposed, killed, ridiculed, tormented, . . . all for His Sake. A headline writer for a newspaper is often positioned better to convey an opinion than the journalists and writers with by-lines. The headline writer probably shares the views of his colleagues on staff at the newspaper, but he is under cover—nameless, faceless, anonymous, and unaccountable—opening the door to temptations: to stretch the truth, to write what seems reasonable but is not altogether true, or to use a word that usually has wider connotations or shades of meaning than are justified by the situation at hand. Then there are editors, who can change just a few words. As an example, how insidious ‘choice’ is. E.g., let people choose ‘just to live their lives’ sounds so reasonable, but it may mean the opposite, to let them terminate their lives. And then terminate the lives of others. Who makes so-called end-of-life decisions for the young, the old, the handicapped . . .? Are these paranoid worries? How close are we to a scenario in which Christians are ridiculed, marginalized, or put outside the metes and bounds of some law? Some legal scholars think that now there exist church teachings that border on or are ‘hate speech’.

You may well be asking, ‘What has any of this to do with the Martyr-King?’ To varying degrees, we in this Society admire him, honor him, venerate him, regard for him with *dulia* (cf. Canon Wright’s sermon, above, p. 28), and ask him to *intercede* for us with God. There are those of our co-religionists with whom we worship side by side, week in and week out, who think we are wrong, misguided, perhaps even deluded, in having such attitudes respecting the Martyr King. What are the possibilities of being ridiculed, marginalized, or even rejected as members in good standing of an ecclesial body based on our beliefs? Straying from an ecclesial body’s ‘faith and discipline’ can carry severe consequences. Departing from one ecclesial body and embracing another, when an impartial, Christian observer might say they came from the same cookie-cutter, has consequences including expensive, lengthy, spiritually debilitating lawsuits, property, and millions of dollars. There are consequences now, and so were there then. In connection with the adoption of the 1662 BCP there were certain conditions, ominous to protestants, because the deadline was Saint Bartholomew’s Day, to protestants “a date which [lived] in infamy”, not because that one of the twelve was skinned alive (hence his symbol, a butcher’s flaying knife) but because on 23 Aug. 1572, the eve of his feast, church bells all over Paris were rung as a signal to begin to kill Huguenots. In Paris after two more nights the toll reached 5-10,000; its extent varied elsewhere in France, throughout which bonfires were lit celebrating the operation’s success. In England, about 2,000 Presbyterian ministers were deprived for failing to assent to the terms of the 1662 Act of Uniformity.

Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., Editor

**Archduke Otto of Austria, 1912-2011**

After the Requiem Mass for his soul, the coffin of Archduke Otto of Austria arrived at the Kapuzinerkirche to be interred. The Prior responded to the MC’s three knocks, “Who desires entry?” Otto of Austria; once Crown Prince of Austria-Hungary; Royal Prince of Hungary and Bohemia, of Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia, Galicia, Lodomeria, and Illyria; Grand Duke of Tuscany and Cracow; Duke of Lorraine, Salzburg, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola and the Bukowina; Grand Prince of Transylvania, Margrave of Moravia; Duke of Upper and Lower Silesia, of Modena, Parma, Piacenza, Guastalla, of Oswiecim and Zator, Teschen, Friaul, Dubrovnik and Zadar; Princely count of Habsburg and Tyrol, of Kyburg, Gorizia and Gradisca; Prince of Trent and Brixen; Margrave of Upper and Lower Lusatia and Istriia; Count of Hohenems, Feldkirch, Bregenz, Sonnenburg, &c.; Lord of Trieste, Kotor and Windic March, Grand Voivod of the Voivodeship of Serbia, &c., &c. The Prior replied, “We do not know him.”
The MC again knocked three times. The Prior asked, “Who desires entry?”

Dr. Otto von Habsburg, President and Honorary President of the Paneuropean Union, Member and quondam President of the European Parliament, honorary doctor of many universities, honorary citizen of many cities in Central Europe, member of numerous venerable academies and institutes, recipient of high civil and ecclesiastical honors, awards, and medals, which were given him in recognition of his decades-long struggle for the freedom of peoples for justice and right. The prior again replied, “We do not know him.” The MC again knocked three times.

For the third time, the Prior asked, “Who desires entry?” The MC replied, “Otto, a mortal and sinful man.” The Prior instructed, “Then let him come in.”

His father was Blessed Charles I, Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary, “Prince of Peace” (d. 1922, beat. 2004). His mother was Her Imperial, Royal, and Apostolic Majesty Zita. From what we read, this eldest son was for his whole life a credit to his saintly parents. Charles was the subject of an article in this magazine (June, 1994, pp. 11-16). Otto was only ten when his father died. Otto’s funerary ceremonies were much like those of his mother, Zita, about a decade ago. What were surely unspeakably moving to the son of Blessed Charles were the ceremonies of beatification, conducted by Pope John Paul II on 3 October 2004. A story by Nicholas Kulish, Berlin, 4 July 2011, on Archduke Otto’s obsequies appeared under the misleading headline, “Otto von Hapsburg, a Would-Be Monarch, Dies at 98”. It is misleading because he was not a grasping individual. The headline says more about whoever wrote it than it says about Otto, and what it says is that almost no one in the general public or the press today understands the institution of monarchy. We are not a monarchist journal, but to paraphrase the saying, ‘we have learned from King Charles I, our Society’s own patron, what responsibility looks like and what license and excess carried out in the abuse of the Divine Right look like. Society as a whole knows less about the subject than it knew nearly a century ago, when the follow-up of the ‘war to end all wars’ caused more damage than the war itself had caused, readying Eastern Europe for the diverse countries of the Austro-Hungarian Empire to become Soviet satellites and Germany to degenerate into the Weimar Republic, which we need not discuss here. One need not agree with every initiative Otto took or every strategy he proposed to concur with those who said that he had more leadership potential than any whom Europe had seen. He did not pursue a selfish or backward-looking vision of an empire he was prohibited ever from ruling but chose to focus on an idealistic, arguably unachievable, more troublesome vision of an entirely united Europe.

He married Princess Regina of Saxe-Meiningen in 1951; she died in 2010. They had five daughters and two sons; they all survive him. His eldest son, Karl, assumes headship of the house of Habsburg. Archduke Otto’s warm, gentle, peaceful nature is evident in his photographic likenesses and in his words. May his soul rest in peace. We have little space for what is, for us, a peripheral subject. There is much on the web about him, an important exemplar for all Christians. There are some splendid historical photos and videos from his funerary ceremonies, including his interment among over a hundred of his dynasty, at sancruensis.wordpress.com.

Leave it to The Guardian: A writer there called Blessed Charles of Austria a ‘buffoon’. Wishing not to be drawn into discussing that characterization, we withhold comment, saying only, it was a cheap shot. As Blessed Charles breathed his last, his gaze was fixed upon the crucifix.

When considering the coverage of the Bible that was a scaffold gift from King Charles to Bishop Loxon back in our June 2011 issue (p. 56), based on an article in The Oxford Times, we commented on the sheer quantity of the gifts, books, clocks, jewels, &c., that the King dispensed, and on the inappropriateness of the word ‘buffoon’ to describe Blessed Charles I of Austria—we should have spoken more strongly:.

**Head of Henri IV Authenticated**

The history of France is as interesting as its English counterpart with which many of us are so familiar. Here, we avoid delving into details, and recount only the basics behind the news story recently reported. Henri IV was the father of our Henriette Marie, who was named for him and her mother, Marie de Médicis, his second wife. That marriage would not have occurred had he not left his Huguenot religion for Roman Catholicism, famously exclaiming “Paris is worth a mass!” A memorable sound-bite in those days’ religious rhetoric, possibly because its irreverent tone played to the streets. The Edict (1598) is now considered forward-looking; it
established toleration of the Huguenots. For his trouble, he was assassinated, leaving Henriette fatherless before she was six months. Her elder brother became King Louis XIII; he ejected his mother, who had assumed regency but he retained her chief minister, Cardinal Richelieu. Their successful partnership was key to the successful reign; the legacy was Louis XIII’s success: he fathered the ‘Sun King’, Louis XIV, who revoked the Edict in 1685.

The bronzed, towering Swede who superintended the schools of Seward AK, named for the visionary who was at first derided for his "Folly", said sayonara to the 'geologically active' Land of the Midnight Sun based on early warnings, one would suppose, but well before the Richter 9 earthquake of 27 March 1964—Seward descended below sewer level—it was not hyperbole: in some coastal towns, the pavement’s fissures were like glacial crevasses and dry land moved 30’ up or down. Carl Carlson came to the Columbia’s shores to Latinize a new generation of Lapps, Danes, Vikings, and Suomalainens. As a bonus, he also taught them world history informally, from memory, using his own ten-minute-a-day syllabus, his legs dangling from his desk-top position.

One day’s vignette summarized that night in 1794 at the necropolis of Saint-Denis, now just outside the bounds of Paris but then practically in the country, “There went the whole French king collection.” It was not irreverent in tone, but suited to his adolescent audience, a public school Latin class comprised of future lumberjacks, salmon-trawlers, and longshoremen. For those who preferred an inside job, there were the plywood mill and the salmon cannery. He imparted a clear sense that 1794's nocturnal business was not for the better. The process was to relieve the sarcophagi of their contents and senselessly to randomize separated or separable body parts, all to desecrate royal remains. When examined later, most could not be identified, but one head’s owners strongly asserted its identity. Perhaps that head had been snatched up immediately, say, from a sarcophagus bearing a very distinct inscription or perhaps for some specific but not apparent reason. A head purported or known to be Henri IV’s by its possessors popped up in the late XIX or early XX Century at the Montmartre gallery of Drouot’s auction house. For many a year, a few sou would buy the royalist or curious tourist a look at it. In 1919 Joseph-Emile Bourdais purchased it for three francs.

A stop to view the head provided the walker a welcome release from his fatigue as he trudged up Montmartre to venerate like so many others the perpetually exposed Host—the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar. Drouot’s widow sold the head to a collector who kept it in his attic. People said he was obsessed with it; he had collected almost everything that referred to it, pictures of paintings of Henri IV, known as “the Great”, the first of the Bourbon Dynasty, doubtless the most popular of French kings, who related well to the ‘man on the street’, had an easy way, and joked with them. At one point the head was offered to the Louvre—it was refused.

Skeptics generally ask, ‘Is/was the view worth the climb?’ The editor answers, Yes. The brilliant whiteness of that confection of the finest wheat flour, suitable to be consecrated by God’s priest using our Lord’s own Words, displayed upon its throne under the equally white, uniquely shaped dome of La Basilique du Sacré Cœur. Beholding the Blessed Sacrament, is it any wonder that “the darkness comprehended it not”? (S. John i: 5) It will be as our Lord promised, “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” (S. Matt. xxviii: 20)

Exposition at the Basilica has been continuous since 1885. Attempts to halt construction continued throughout the process. In debate it was denounced as “an incessant provocation to civil war”. Organized against it were radicals, Communards (those who remember the Paris Commune fondly), and Georges Clemenceau, who opposed religion from his youth. The dome’s whiteness may be attributed to architect Paul Abadie’s choice of building material, travertine quarried at Château-Landon, France. The stone continually exudes calcite, which coats the surface, protecting it from pollution. It is responsible for the dome’s extraordinary whiteness.

As you know, Henri IV made some bold decisions. They cost him. In 1598 he promulgated the Edict of Nantes, granting a measure of religious freedom to the Huguenots, the largest protestant group in France, even as he himself, of a Huguenot family and protestant sympathies became Roman Catholic, the act that prompted his saying quoted in the first paragraph on this topic. François Ravaillac assassinated him on 14 May 1610, when Henriette Marie (b. 25 Nov. 1609) was only five months old.

The head has been reportedly identified by a specialist in such things. It is an odd fact that with all of today’s applicable forensic technologies, the definitive determination of the head’s identity—Henri IV—was made visually. Comparison of a contemporary painting of Henri with an image of the actual head viewed from
the same angle provided the strongest confirmatory evidence: the scar from a knife wound inflicted in an unsuccessful 1594 assassination attempt is seen in the painting and is still visible on the relic. This conclusion was announced on 16 December 2010 by the team of 19 historians and scientists who had studied the mumified head for nine months. They have been involved in other high-profile cases, showing that the remains at Chateau de Chinnon said to be Joan of Arc's were not.

Supervised by the Prince Regent, the 1813 opening of King Charles I's lead coffin had as its sole purpose to confirm his identity as the occupant of that coffin in that vault at St. George's Chapel, Windsor. The physical evidence, entirely in agreement with historical accounts, was all circumstantial. The clean cut through the vertebra was inflicted by a blow from a very sharp, heavy instrument. Uh-huh. Those present were ultimately convinced of the head's identity upon viewing it and their familiarity with van Dyck's paintings of King Charles.

[Based on a report in Fortean Times (in turn based on reports in/by the British Medical Journal, BBC News 15 Dec. 2010, AP, and the Independent 16 Dec. 2010), brought to our attention by Miss Eileen O'Leary, whom we thank.

The Editor deliberately interwove several story lines, secular, the Eucharistic, the supernatural, and the architectural, the head of Henry IV, the meanings of Montmartre, the royal and the religious, the Bourbon and the Stuart. It is not unorganized, but a meditation. I pray our readers do not take offense.]

**A Kalendar of Anniversaries – mid-November through May**

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

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

**Nov.** 18 Nativity of S. Charles, K.M. Charles Stuart born at Dunfermline Castle to King James VI of Scots and his Queen, Anne of Denmark, 1600

30 Andrew, Ap.M. Patron of the Scots Kingdom, c. 60

**Dec.** 1 Φ Nicholas Ferrar, Dn., Founder of Little Gidding community, visited by King Charles, 1637

6 Φ Nativity of S. Henry of Windsor, K.C., 1421

8 Φ Immaculate Conception, B.V.M. Under this title, the Mother of God is the Patron Saint of the U.S.A.

9 † Sir Anthony van Dyck, primary portraitist of King Charles I, died, 1641

12 Φ 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 Φ Thomas Becket, Abp.M., martyred in Canterbury Cathedral at the altar, 1170 (7 July, transl. of relics)

31 Birth of Prince Charles (King Charles II), son of King James III & IV, III, Palazzo Mutti, Rome, 1720

**Jan.** 1 King Charles II crowned at Scone, 1651

5 Φ King Edward the Confessor died, 1066 (feast-day, 13 Oct.)

10 Φ 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 Φ Beheading of Louis XVI, King of France, 1793

27 Sentence pronounced on King Charles I, 1649 “I may speak after the sentence—ever!”

28 Φ 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 Φ Decollation of S. Charles, King & Martyr, Whitehall, 1649 “Remember!” Accession of Charles II.

30 Society of King Charles the Martyr's first yearly Mass, S. Margaret Pattens, London, 1895

30 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
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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, mother of King James VI, King 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., 1682

Mar. 1 * David, B.C., Patron Saint of Wales, c. 544
6 Henry, Duke of York (King Henry IX; Cardinal York), younger son of King James III & VIII, born and
Baptized by Pope Benedict XIII, Palazzo Mutì, Rome, 1725
16 * John de Brébeuf, SJ, Apostle of the Hurons, Patron of Canada, & Companions, MM., 1649
17 * Patrick, B.C., Patron Saint 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 VI & I 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, Pr., 1631  Note: Unless otherwise stated, or obvious, listing is by year of death

Apr. 1 Finding of the Incorrupt Body of S. Charles, K.M., at Windsor, 1813
7 * 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 Recognition of the Cultus (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 &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 Society was founded at Saint Margaret Pattens, Eastcheap, City of London, on Easter Tuesday, 27 March 1894, by Ermgarda (The Hon. Mrs. Patrick) Greville-Nugent (née Ogilvie) 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 (American Region Founder) with The Rev’d Robert Thomas Nichol.

An asterisk (*) denotes 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.

NOTES

General Notes for this issue. Each note commences with the page number of its origin, in parentheses.

a. (p. 1) Why does 4 April appear as our Foundation Date in old issues of C&K, SKCM News and other sources, rather than 27 March, the correct date? In the course of fact-checking, a person, perhaps the first Foundress, made an error reading across 'A Table to Find Easter Day' in the Prayer Book and skipped a line, from the year of our Foundation, 1894 (Easter Tuesday, 27 March), up one line to 1893 (Easter Tuesday, 4 April), which would have given rise to the widely perpetuated error. The Editor thanks Robin Davies for this insight.
Notes to Canon Wright’s sermon, p. 28
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LIKENESS OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR BY SIR NINIAN COMPER, IN STAINED GLASS

Sir John Ninian Comper (1864–1960), a versatile architect and designer in all media is buried in Westminster Abbey. Many consider him the greatest ecclesiastical architect/designer of the XX Century. He was a Vice President of the Society of King Charles the Martyr 1950-60. He trained first as a stained glass painter in Kempe’s London studio and continued to apply himself to that art. As such, it is not surprising that he created such an image as adorns the front cover of this issue of SKCM News, and likely more. Although Sir Ninian's highly recognizable works—entire churches, chapels, windows, furnishings such as pulpits, altars, reading desks, and high mass vestments—are often seen in England, there is only one of his works in the United States, the sumptuous but understated Leslie Lindsey Memorial Chapel of Emmanuel Church, Boston. It is her father's memorial of her and her new husband, Stewart Mason of Ipswich, England, who were among the 1,201 lost in the sinking of Cunard's luxury flagship RMS Lusitania in May 1917 by the hostile action of U-Boat U-20.

We will publish more about Comper, the specific window and its location, Saint Mary Magdalene, Gillingham, Kent, in our next issue. The photo credit is to Simon Knott, simonknott.co.uk, with gratitude and appreciation.
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THE REV’D ALFRED J. MILLER, D.D.

The Rev’d Alfred J. Miller, D.D., preached a Tercentenary Sermon on Sunday 30 January 1949 at Saint Thomas, Regent Street, London. Dr. Miller’s sermon was preached to a large congregation.

The year’s main commemoration, called the Festival High Mass, was at Saint Margaret’s, Westminster, on Monday 31 January. There the Bishop of Ely preached the Tercentenary Sermon. This was in accordance with S.K.C.M.’s policy of celebrating the Royal Martyrdom on the day itself, except when it falls on Sunday, in which case it is celebrated on Monday. In 1949, the Tercentenary Year, 30 January fell on Sunday. The opportunity was taken to have an extra mass on Sunday, anticipating large crowds because of the large, round number of years elapsed since the martyrdom itself. The Society’s Monday gathering was not at Saint Mary-le-Strand as was then customary because it was not available or thought to be too small, but rather at the available, larger Saint Margaret’s, Westminster. Yet, ironically, the opportunity was missed to celebrate the Tercentenary on the actual Tercentenary, 30 January!

Although some details appear in The White King (WK, Vol. I), no complete order of events for 30-31 January 1949 is given. The text of the Bishop’s sermon of Monday 31 January notes that it was then morning. The mass may have been early or late morning.

It is elsewhere stated that devotions on Sunday the 30th were at 1:45 p.m. outside the Banqueting House. This is understood to be the spot immediately beneath the location of the chopping block which was on the scaffold, above, near the present leaden bust. There were hymns and prayers, and a wreath was placed, followed by a procession to the [cuestrian] statue. Clarifying this, we read that the order of service “was so admired that it was suggested that the annual service should always be there, for up to then the Devotions and wreath laying had been held at the statue.” (WK, Vol. I, p. 23) It is not stated whether the devotions were before or after the mass, but likely after since mass time would then have been typical of Sunday High Mass time, beginning around 11 a.m. or noon.

Father Miller was American Representative, S.K.C.M., c 1950-55. This appointment seems to have accompanied a flurry of activity around the Tercentenary, including the first placement since 1918 of an advertisement in the Annual for 1952 and a scheduled, but unsuccessful U.S. gathering in 1951, Evensong at Fr. Miller’s parish, Christ Church, Ridgewood, diocese of Newark, New Jersey. Also, he was the Hon. U.S. Chaplain of the Royal Stuart Society. He was made British S.K.C.M.’s VP for America in 1958 but there is no evidence that he was active thereafter. Perhaps the false start demoralized him.

We thank sometime Society member Timothy Kasza for discovering the photograph of Dr. Miller among material at Nashotah House, where he was Director of Development and Alumni Affairs. (Father Miller had no known association with Nashotah House.) He attended seminary in New York City at Jewish Theological and Union Theological Seminaries.
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(photograph, discovered in Nashotah House files by Tim Kasza)